SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 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:

Our Father God, as we bow at this high altar of the national life, preserve us from praying with our lips only, and not with our hearts and minds. We come in an anxious hour of human destiny, solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught. Help us in these trying days to rise above all that is base and small and to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, the safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all the peoples of this stricken earth who unite with us in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of a new life to all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

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 Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and several other Senators may be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week. I make the request so that I and other members of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may be permitted to visit Mexico in connection with the foot-and-mouth-disease-eradication program being conducted in Mexico by the United States Government. Those who, as at present I understand, intend to make the trip, are the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and I. We are members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, for the purpose of participating in the work of the subcommittee alluded to by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attending all meetings of the Senate during the coming week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week. I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, headed by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], which will make a trip to Mexico, as announced by the Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to give notice of hearing on the nomination of a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 3, 1950, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Charles S. Hatfield, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

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

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Pennsylvania lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, of Harrisburg, Pa., signed by John D. Coleman, recording secretary, relating to the internal security of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTEST AGAINST COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the conservation chairman of the Wisconsin Garden Club Federation opposing the Columbia Valley Administration bill, S. 1645. The chairman, Mrs. Alfred Kieckhefer, has presented four important reasons for opposition to the CVA bill, which is now pending before the Senate Public Works Committee.

I have heard from many other conservation organizations in Wisconsin which are also deeply concerned about this bill. I, for one, certainly share their apprehension over granting more Federal authority to a three-man board or a five-man board or any other small group of individuals who would be vested with practically life and death authority over an entire region of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the Wisconsin Garden Club Federation be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

WISCONSIN GARDEN CLUB FEDERATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 20, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As the conservation chairman of the Wisconsin Garden Clubs, I am writing you about bill S. 1645 which is to come up shortly before Congress. We have a total of over 100 clubs with a membership of well over 3,000. Our primary interest in the bill is the threat to all the conservation projects already undertaken in that region as well as those about to be begun. We also are troubled by the way the authority is handled. We object to this bill on the following grounds:

1. The sacrifice of natural resources to water power.
2. Confiscation of more Indian lands.
3. Destruction of natural waterways.
4. The entire set-up, giving a three-man board such absolute authority, undermining all State and local control.

It will be to the best interests of all of us, if you and your colleagues will vigorously oppose this bill.

Yours very truly,
ALLISON MORE KIECKHEFER.
Mrs. Alfred Kieckhefer.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4393. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283); and

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend sections 10, 11, and 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1284).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2113. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers; with amendments (Rept. No. 1285).

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT REPORTED

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an additional amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill (S. 2246) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1286) thereon.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stanford C. Stiles, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3107. A bill for the relief of Boleslaw H. Drobinski, his wife, Marjorie, and his daughter, Janina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3108. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THYE for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG introduced Senate bill 3109, to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3110. A bill relating to the conveyance of certain property in Shawnee, Okla., by quitclaim deed, to Alfred F. Hunter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3111. A bill to provide for the leasing of the lands and real estate of members of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma who do not have certificates of competency, and for other purposes; and

S. 3112. A bill to provide for the conveyance to William Sandmann of certain real property in Coal County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3113 (by request). A bill to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3114. A bill for the relief of Zakia Antaky Ackad; and

S. 3115. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HUMPHREY also introduced Senate bill 3116, providing for the repeal of section 601, title VI, of the Revenue Act of 1941, pertaining to the Committee To Investigate Federal Expenditures, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3117. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3118. A bill relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3119. A bill to amend Public Law No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 3120. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings, to extend coverage to architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. KEM introduced Senate bill 3121, for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 3122. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 3123. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of February 26, 1944, entitled "An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3124. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, with respect to distribution of proceeds of mineral leases on unsurveyed public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. WHERRY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 154, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgage insurance under section 608 of such act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial commemorating the contributions of Americans of all faiths and ethnic origins to victory in World War II; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DEVELOPMENT OF SHIPPING ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLAS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. FERGUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the senior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. LANGER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. WILEY), the junior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, which is intended to help meet the need for reviving the package freight facilities on the Great Lakes. Development of these facilities, which have been curtailed as a result of the diversion of Great Lakes ships during the war is meeting the immediate national requirements of our war effort, is of the greatest importance to the commercial development and economic well-being of the entire Great Lakes region. For that reason, I wish to add that I shall welcome the support of other Senators from those States who may wish to join as cosponsors of this legislation.

I introduced a similar bill a year ago, and it is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the present time. I feel that the bill I now introduce is an improvement over the bill introduced a year ago.

The bill (S. 3109) to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THYE and other senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MARIO JUAN BLAS BESSO-PIANETTO

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a short explanation of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, because the courts have ruled they are without jurisdiction to review the matter, I am introducing a bill to stay deportation proceedings against Dr. Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto, an outstanding surgeon of St. Louis, Mo.

According to his associates, Dr. Pianetto, a native of Argentina, is a skilled thoracic surgeon, and his deportation will be a loss to the medical profession in the St. Louis area. They say Dr. Pianetto's absence will be felt particularly by many who are suffering from tuberculosis. At the present time, Dr. Pianetto is resident physician at Koch Hospital, the St. Louis tuberculosis sanitarium; he is surgeon instructor at St. Louis University and consulting surgeon at the State psychiatric hospital, in St. Louis.

His friends and patients believe that Dr. Pianetto's present difficulties, which will end in his deportation unless the Congress intervenes, are due to a mistake made by a draft-board clerk during the war.

It is contended that a draft-board clerk at a time when she was under pressure in her work, gave him the wrong form to fill out; and that Dr. Pianetto at that time, not understanding English too well, filled out the form handed to him without question.

The form which he was given to fill out, and which he did fill out, did not correctly describe his status at that time. It is contended by the immigration authorities that the error was grievous enough that the Government had no alternative save to deport him in the absence of congressional action. Attached to the form which he signed there appeared a statement to the effect that in signing it, he would forever be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The immigration authorities state that as an alien disqualified to become a citizen he is ineligible to remain in this country.

The form which he was given was Form 301, which was for registration of resident aliens. He should have been given, and should have filled out, Form 302, for registration of nonresident aliens, since he was an exchange student on temporary stay in this country. There seems to be no question about that, but the Immigration and Naturalization Service claims they have no alternative except to proceed under the statement which he did sign. Their position in this respect seems to be sound. The form Dr. Pianetto should have signed, Form 302, does not contain the statement concerning ineligibility for citizenship.

The United States district courts in St. Louis and in Washington, D. C., have ruled they have no jurisdiction to review the case. Therefore, Dr. Pianetto's only recourse is to Congress.

The case was brought to my attention recently when I was in St. Louis, by some of Dr. Pianetto's patients and friends. Some of the leading physicians and surgeons in St. Louis are interested in the effort to save Dr. Pianetto from deportation. They contend that his deportation will be a serious loss to the medical profession.

Meantime, the St. Louis Star-Times, an outstanding newspaper in my State, has become interested in the case. I am informed by Harry Wohl, of its Washington bureau, that they have succeeded in locating the draft-board clerk who is alleged to have given Dr. Pianetto the wrong form to fill out. The clerk has admitted the probability of error.

I want to make it clear that in introducing this bill, I am not importuning the Congress to permit an alien who should be deported to remain in this country. Neither am I asking that the consequences of executing Form 301 be waived if Dr. Pianetto executed that form knowing of its contents and the resulting effects. But if this man, a potential benefactor of the sick, is subject to deportation through the error of a representative of the Government, then I hope that Congress will right the wrong and permit him to remain in this country.

In 1946 Dr. Pianetto went to Canada, applied for a permanent visa, and reentered the United States to apply for citizenship. Then came the warrant for arrest, based on the draft form which, it is contended, he mistakenly filled out.

I am not one who advocates breaking down our immigration barriers, or who is opposed to the deportation of undesirable aliens. I have no desire to assist anyone who has consciously dodged the draft. I ask that an investigation be made by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. If the facts are proven to be as alleged by Dr. Pianetto, I believe the Congress should pass a bill to permit this accomplished surgeon to remain in the United States.

The bill (S. 3121) for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Pianetto, introduced by Mr. KEM, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUNT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4567, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the committee to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, 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.

STORY OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS TOLD BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Story of Alexander Hamilton as Told by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG," published in the February issue of the magazine Sons of the American Revolution, which appears in the Appendix.]

FANTASTIC LUSTRON CASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH (PA.) PRESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fantastic Lustron Case," published in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of recent date, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR THYE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by him at Sacramento, Calif., on February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

STALIN'S STOOGES LEFT IMPRINT ON AMERICAN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin's Stooges Left Imprint on American Policy," published in the February 25, 1950, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERTY IN CRISIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Liberty in Crisis," delivered by him at the thirtieth anniversary dinner of the American Civil Libertes Union in New York City on February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COSTS OF ELECTION IN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding election costs in the United States and in England, by Gould Lincoln, from the Evening Star of February 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOUL SEARCHERS FIND NO ANSWER—ARTICLE FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Soul Searchers Find No Answer," published in the current issue of Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INDIANA STATE BANNER—REMARKS BY MRS. ROYAL EASON INGERSOLL

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper entitled "The Indiana State Banner," read by Mrs. Royal Eason Ingersoll, designated representative of Mrs. Roscoe C. O'Byrne, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the Indiana State Society of Washington celebration of the sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory (1800–1950) on February 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHESON LOGIC—COMMENT BY REV. JAMES M. GILLIS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column of comment entitled "Acheson Logic," by Rev. James M. Gillis, CSP, published in the Witness, of Dubuque, Iowa, for February 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OLD ORDER PASSETH—LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE CINCINNATI INQUIRER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "The Old Order Passeth," written by Ed Wimmer to the editor, and published in the Cincinnati Inquirer of January 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BANKRUPTCY RESULTS IN DICTATORSHIP—ARTICLE BY HASSIL E. SCHENCK

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bankruptcy Results in Dictatorship," written by Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and published in the Hoosier Farmer, February 1950 edition, which appears in the Appendix.]

BYRD JOINS GOP ATTACK ON TRUMAN—ARTICLE BY EDWARD T. FOLLIARD

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "BYRD Joins GOP Attack on Truman," written by Edward T. Folliard, and published in the Washington Post of February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTO STALIN'S VESTIBULE—ARTICLE BY "HEPTISAX"

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Into Stalin's Vestibule" written by "Heptisax" and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SAME OLD ANSWER—EDITORIAL FROM THE PALLADIUM-ITEM, OF RICHMOND, IND.

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Same Old Answer," published in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY—CONTEST PAPER BY ROBERT SHANKS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the original script of a contest paper entitled "I Speak for Democracy," by Robert Shanks, of Lebanon, Ind., written in October 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPRAISAL OF MILITARY DEFENSES OF THE UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Elemental Facts of 1950," published in the current issue of Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT—ARTICLE BY JERRY KLUTTZ

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to Communists in Government employment, by Jerry Kluttz, from the Washington Post of February 19, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DEFENSE BUDGET—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the defense budget, by David Lawrence, from the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT—STATEMENT BY GOV. VAL PETERSON

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relating to the Missouri River Basin development, made by Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, before the War Department Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on February 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY—ESSAY CONTEST—ESSAYS BY MARIE JESAKOW, W. C. BEATLY, AND LAWRENCE J. MELLON, JR.

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the three winning essays in the I Speak for Democracy essay contest among the high-school students of Philadelphia, which appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF EXAMINERS IN CHIEF IN PATENT OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2328) to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 482 of the Revised Statutes (35 U. S. C. 7) is amended by adding the following paragraph:

"The Commissioner, when in his discretion considered necessary to maintain the work of the board of appeals current, may designate any examiner of the primary examiner grade or higher, having the requisite ability, to serve as examiner in chief for periods not exceeding 6 months each, and any examiner so designated shall be qualified to act as a member of the board of appeals. Not more than one primary examiner shall be among the members of the board of appeals hearing an appeal."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office."

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read a letter from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and to comment briefly upon it.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say that last evening the Committee on Banking and Currency voted to report a housing bill by a vote of 9 to 4. Certain members of the committee reserved the right to file minority views, and others reserved the right to file individual statements or amendments.

The amendment, which is a substitute for a bill now on the calendar, will be filed later today, but the report on it will not be filed until the members of the committee have had an opportunity to file whatever minority views they desire to present. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] will file the minority views, and some of the other members of the committee may also file individual statements. In the meantime Congress is confronted with the fact that section 608 of the old law will expire March the first, together with other authorizations for mortgage insurance.

Last October 5, in the Senate, there was some dissatisfaction, I might say, on the part of some Members of the Senate, as well as by various organizations, when we failed to act on permanent legislation, but instead passed a joint resolution extending the housing program until March 1 of this year. The bill I shall file today is the bill we shall report Monday as a substitute for the bill then pending on the calendar.

I stated at that time that when Congress met again this year we would immediately take up the housing legislation, and that I hoped for once and all we would settle the many differences. The Committee on Banking and Currency realizes it is its duty to report a bill and to submit a majority report, as well as to allow the opportunity for the submission of minority views. We realize that, after all, the committee is a creature of the Senate. Thus I shall file the amendment to the bill on behalf of the committee today and the report on Monday.

In the meantime there is great confusion among contractors, insurance companies, banks, and other lending institutions throughout the United States, because section 608 will expire on the first of March, and it is doubtful whether we can within 2 days pass the bill which is to be reported. I share that doubt; I do not believe we can. In the past when section 608 has expired there were likewise periods of no existing authorizations and no insurance guaranties until Congress acted. Usually it has taken 2 or 3 weeks to get action on the matter of renewal but the section has always been renewed.

Now businessmen, insurance companies, contractors, and all others interested in housing fear that because of the new bill, which does not extend section 608 but substitutes for it a revised section 207, they might have to file all over again.

I wish now to read a letter which brings that matter before the Senate.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, has been conscious of the fact that there would be a deadline with respect to section 608.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I talked with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency about that deadline. It is my understanding that the Senator from South Carolina has conferred with the Housing Administrator with respect to what would happen in the event section 608 should expire without further action being taken, and I understand the Senator from South Carolina has a letter explaining that matter, which he desires to read to the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I wish to do, so that banks, insurance companies, contractors, and others interested may know exactly what the law

will be after the Congress passes the bill to be reported.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will there be an opportunity, under the order of business, to ask a question, if the letter is to be read?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be very pleased to answer any question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely desire to make it clear to the Senator from Nebraska that last October 5, when this matter was before the Senate, and the expiration date was fixed at March 1, I stated that as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee we would act on a housing bill and we could decide once and for all what we would do about these housing problems.

I shall now read the letter, so that there may be no misunderstanding as to the present situation.

Mr. Foley, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, after I had a conference with him yesterday and again this morning, addressed a letter to me as to what the Housing and Home Finance Agency will do under the bill which will be reported to the Senate on Monday. He says in the letter:

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: As you know, the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on large-scale rental projects under the emergency 608 program expires on March 1. As has always been the case when the expiration date for any FHA-insuring authority is approaching, an unusually large number of applications are filed with the FHA offices in order to beat the deadline.

Mr. President, that has occurred every time we approached an expiration date.

This situation has again prevailed in connection with the approaching expiration of section 608. This has been the case, notwithstanding the fact that this agency has repeatedly indicated that no extension of section 608 would be recommended.

I think it would be a matter of interest to you to know that because of the large volume of applications being received by FHA field offices and the accompanying pressure to process section 608 cases before the March 1 expiration date, instructions were issued to all field offices under date of January 23 reiterating the FHA policy of quality rather than quantity processing. In addition, field offices were instructed to notify all mortgagees submitting section 608 applications that if the case was processed to the point where cost estimating was completed but no commitment was made prior to the expiration date, the fees would not be returned. Of course, if cases are not processed to the point where the fees are earned, the fees will be returned to the sponsor.

Mr. President, this is one of the questions which is of much concern today to all the contractors, architects, and engineers throughout the country.

The last paragraph of the letter is the most important of all:

The FHA field offices were also instructed to notify sponsors that in any case where section 608 applications were processed but not committed prior to the March 1 expiration date, the sponsor would have the option of converting to a section 207 application and being credited with the examination fees paid. While no new application is necessary in order to convert to a section 207 application, insurance could not be issued unless all of the requirements of section 207 were met.

For the benefit of Senators who are not on the Committee on Banking and Currency, the main difference, as I understand it, between section 608 and section 207 in the new bill which I filed today, is that section 608 provided a guaranty on loans up to 90 percent of the cost of a project. Section 207 provides for guaranty of 90 percent on the first $7,000 value of the project and 60 percent on any additional value up to $10,000. The maximum is $8,100, to be allowed on a project which has an average of four and one-half rooms. The maximum otherwise would be $7,200.

Mr. President, when the committee amended section 207, it in effect extended section 608 but on a less liberal loan basis. There will still be a 90-percent loan on anything up to $7,000; but when the value of the project exceeds $7,000, there is not to be a 90-percent loan, unless the project provides what your committee considers adequate space for the average family, not one room and efficiency units as are provided in so many of the 608 projects being built throughout the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has so ably presented the features of the new section, which I understood him to say would constitute section 207——

Mr. MAYBANK. It is section 207 of the clean bill which the Banking and Currency Committee ordered to be reported in place of the bill now on the calendar. It has, in addition, title 1 and title 2; title 3, which is quite controversial; title 4, covering direct grants to veterans; and title 5, covering school and university housing loans. Section 608 has, in effect, been transferred to the new section 207.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that it is hoped by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that the proposed section 207 will be written into law, when the measure covering it comes before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. I hope it will be. Let me say it authorizes $1,750,000,000 for title 2, which includes section 207.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. First, in attempting to lay a foundation for a question I should like to ask, let me say that the conditions under section 207 are different from those under section 608, as I understand, in the respect that under section 608, if I correctly recall, the insurance guaranty was 90 percent up to $9,000 per unit.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I now understand that under section 207 the proposal is that the guaranty applies up to $7,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and 60 percent for the difference between $7,000 and $10,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure that those conditions can be met or will be met or should be met by contractors who already have filed applications, and some of whose applications were placed on file as early as November 1949, according to some of the letters I have received.

So I am asking the distinguished Senator from South Carolina this question: In the case of contractors who have made a great outlay of funds or to anyone else who has done so, in making application under section 608, if the applications have already been filed—I am not asking the Senator to extend beyond March 1 the deadline under which applications might be made under section 608 in the future—since there has been a bottleneck, and the applications could not be processed, although through no fault of those who made the applications, does not the Senator think it would be only fair that there should be an amendment to section 207 or else a special resolution, or something of the sort, to provide relief for those whose applications are on file and have been on file, and yet have not been processed, but through no fault of their own?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I always regret exceedingly that I cannot give a direct "Yes" or "No" answer to a question. However, the situation is that yesterday the President released an additional $300,000,000 to take care of a large number of applications which had been filed; and also I must remind the Senator that the FHA notified in plenty of time all those who were interested that they could give no assurance that all the applications received could be processed. My information is that at the present rate applications, by March 1, will amount to between $1,000,000,000 and $1,500,000,000.

Yesterday we revised the authorization in the bill downward; we reduced from $6,000,000,000 to $3,600,000,000 the authorizations and insurance, because of the testimony of representatives of the Federal Reserve Board that otherwise the bill would be inflationary. We did all we thought necessary to remove any inflationary features that may have existed in the bill.

The Senator has asked me a direct question. I can see his point, of course; but I would not say that it would be right to act or to grant all the applications, they would run, perhaps, into the hundreds of thousands in number. I am advised that the applicants have been notified that they were taking a risk in filing them. The President has used all the money authorized by Congress last year for this purpose.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am perfectly willing to leave the date of notification the way it is, and I am not asking that any of the applications be granted. Certainly they should stand the test, just as all other applications should.

I agree that the inflationary aspect of the matter should be given every consid-

eration. I am not asking at all that the date be extended. But inasmuch as the conditions under section 207 are different from those under section 608, I ask the distinguished Senator whether it is not fair that applicants who had made their applications as far back as November 1949, should at least have opportunity to have their applications processed. Of course, they can be turned down if they do not comply.

Mr. MAYBANK. I could not differ with the Senator from Nebraska if all the applications had been on file since November 1. But what the agency is confronted with is applications running up to the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, probably beyond a billion dollars, which have just been filed because of the deadline of March 1.

But I agree as to applications which were filed in November.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to state the exact date after which applications shall be turned down or rejected. I have hoped that the Senator would handle this matter before the bill comes up on the floor. If he can do so, I shall be very glad.

Under the circumstances, I think the only thing for me to do is to offer an amendment to be considered when the bill covering section 207 is brought up.

I hope the Senator from South Carolina will be able to assure us that section 207 will accomplish the desired purpose. If it does not, it seems to me the only thing to do is to wait and to debate the issue when the bill is considered. But I humbly submit to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who I know has done a great deal of work on this matter—and of course I know it is a difficult task—that it seems to me the applications which have been made under section 608, but have never been processed because of the bottleneck in getting to the applications, at least should be considered. If they can comply under section 207, that will be satisfactory with me. If they cannot comply, that likewise will be satisfactory. But it seems to me they should at least be considered and the applicants who made them should be given an opportunity to have their applications examined under section 608, because it is no fault of theirs that their applications have not been handled before now. If they made the offer in good faith and if they filed the contract in good faith, certainly their applications at least should be processed. If the application does not meet with the approval of the Federal Housing Authority, certainly it should be turned down.

I am not asking the distinguished Senator to extend beyond March 1 the date up to which applications may be filed. But it seems to me it is only justice, in the case of those who have made a great outlay in filing their applications, that they should at least be given an opportunity to have their applications processed.

I should like to have the distinguished Senator from South Carolina go along with that idea, because I know he has done so much work on this matter. I should like to have had his complete assurance, of course. I do not wish to take up any further time now, however.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that no one has a greater regard for him than I have, and of course we have worked together on many housing projects. But the Housing and Home Finance Agency, through the FHA, notified these persons in January. I may say that on February 1, in an attempt to try to beat the deadline of March 1, there were applications in the amount of $800,000,000 under section 608; and my information is that by March 1 the amount will be $1,500,000,000.

As chairman of the committee, I certainly do not want to approve anything that will lead to any further inflation. But if the Senator submitted such a resolution, I would be only too glad to hold hearings on it. Of course, I know there are two sides to this question.

I believe we can work out something which will be fair to those who have filed applications, as well as fair to those who have the responsibility for this tremendous amount of authorizations and insurance guaranties.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is perfectly satisfactory with the Senator from Nebraska.

As to the applications which have been jammed in yesterday and the day before, I completely agree with the Senator from South Carolina. I am not certain what the cut-off date should be.

So I think I shall introduce a joint resolution, and hope that it will be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, and that it will be regarded there with favor, so that some cut-off date can be established, and also so that applications which were filed back in November can receive some consideration.

I think that will be the best thing to do, so far as housing is concerned; and I hope the matter will be handled in the next few days.

(Mr. WHERRY subsequently introduced the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 154) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgage insurance under section 608 of such act, which was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

Mr. MAYBANK. I assure the Senator that, as he knows, we shall certainly be happy to have hearings and shall certainly look into the matter. When I say that applications in the amount of $800,000,000 were rushed in on February 1, and a great deal more are on file today, I know the Senator will agree that the subject does deserve careful consideration. There is always an attempt to beat the deadline by those who desire to undertake projects.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is done by those who desire to have the Government guarantee the insurance or the loan. In substance, their profit is also guaranteed.

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

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

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the evidence we have been getting before the Committee on Banking and Currency is to the effect that under section 608 the Government is frequently lending more to the contractors than is required to build the housing projects; and that in many cases section 608 projects are being built with Government-guaranteed loans substantially exceeding the actual cost of constructing the project, and that, in large measure, is what has been responsible for the large flow of loan applications. Furthermore, the Committee on Banking and Currency last year recommended that the guaranty be reduced from 90 percent to 80 percent, recognizing the fact that many of the loans represented no actual equity in the investment at all on the part of the person who would own the properties and that they were very high-rent properties, which, in many cases, are now standing vacant because the rents are so high.

Mr. MAYBANK. I must agree with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that most of the section 608 loans do not benefit the poor people of the United States.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, in my section of the Nation many housing units are standing idle today because of the high rents demanded. Otherwise, people would be in housing they could not afford. They cannot pay the high rents required by a program of this kind.

Mr. MAYBANK. After we heard the evidence of Mr. McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board, and after there had been pointed out the dangers of inflation, in connection with titles 1 and 2 and 3, I hesitate to say to my good friend from Nebraska that I shall be willing to make any yes-or-no statement concerning a matter which involves $1,500,000,000, but I think those who have filed their applications have a right to be heard.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Does the Senator from South Carolina feel that any kind of loan, in connection with which there is no equity investment, and where the amount of the loan actually exceeds the cost to the contractor or to the person owning the property, is sound and in the interest of the Government to guarantee?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I certainly do not, and for that reason the committee amended title III to require a 5-percent stock subscription, plus an additional 5 percent over a period of years, in order that the Government might have a 10-percent equity under title III, plus the one-quarter of 1 percent reserve for losses, all of which will liquidate the loans in approximately 36 years, if I remember correctly.

Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I promised to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina certainly

understood the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, I certainly did.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not sanction, certainly, the practice referred to by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I agree with him 100 percent. The difficulty has arisen because of the administration of the act. The point I am making is simply this: Is it not fair, considering the way in which the act was administered and is being administered now, that the applications which have been on file for months at least should be processed? That is all I am asking.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the applications which have been on file for a reasonable length of time should be processed. I refer to applications which were filed in an effort to beat the deadline. That was my point.

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. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement. We are now on the so-called cotton and peanut acreage allotment resolution, House Joint Resolution 398. It is the desire of the Senator from Illinois and of Senators on the other side of the aisle to finish action on the joint resolution this afternon, even though it may necessitate a night session.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the majority leader mean that in the event the joint resolution is not finished by 5 or 6 o'clock, there will be a night session?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I assure the distinguished majority leader that the minority will cooperate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall ask recognition for the purpose of speaking on the pending amendment to House Joint Resolution 398.

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

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

REPORTS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a report presented on February 14, 1950, for printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a report of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures. It is my belief that the press release pertaining to this report, as well as the report itself, presents a distorted picture of Federal employment. The joint committee's press release, seeking to create the impression that Federal employment is increasing, states in its first paragraph:

> Federal employment in civilian agencies of the executive branch turned sharply upward during December with over-all increases averaging more than 143 a day.

However, Mr. President, in the third paragraph of the same release, the joint committee states that:

> The net decrease of 4,803 in the executive branch as a whole brought total employment down to 1,981,156, which, again in December, was a new low since 1942.

This type of presentation, Mr. President, is typical of the type of report filed by this joint committee.

I am also forced, Mr. President, to protest the statements made in the same release concerning the Post Office Department. Again I quote:

> Such reductions as were made in other civilian agencies of the Government were largely nullified by the steady addition of permanent employees in the Post Office Department. In the decade since 1939 average employment by the Post Office Department has increased by more than a quarter of a million, from a 1939 average of 297,191 to an average over the past 6 months of 529,735, an increase of 78 percent.

Mr. President, during this same period, 1939 through 1949, the weight of the mail carried by the Post Office Department increased 104 percent, special services increased 70 percent, and the number of pieces of mail handled 64 percent.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I must protest this type of presentation.

Mr. President, in view of the nature of the report, I wish to send to the desk a bill, which I ask be properly referred. Also, I ask that I may make a brief statement in reference to the bill, in order to explain its purposes.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal title VI, section 601 of the "Revenue Act of 1941," Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress.

This title established, in 1941, a committee to investigate Federal expenditures, which has since become known as the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, or the Byrd committee. The legislation creating the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, provided that—

> It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved in 1946, exactly the same duties were assigned to the House and Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as standing committees, that is, "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." Therefore, since 1946, the Senate and House have each had two Expenditures Committees, with overlapping and duplicating functions.

Let us now look at the intent of Congress in passing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The prime objectives of that act were to reduce the myriad of committees, and to clearly define their duties and responsibilities so they would not have overlapping and duplicating activities. In effect the Congress superseded the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the creation of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with all expenditures functions vested in these standing committees. The Eightieth Congress took cognizance of this situation by refusing to further appropriate for the joint committee. However, the joint committee did secure funds in the Eighty-first Congress in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act.

Dr. George Galloway, an outstanding authority on legislative reorganization, supported the abolition of the joint committee at hearings held by the Senate Expenditures Committee considering amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, in February 1948, when he stated that the functions of the joint committee duplicated the functions allocated to the Committee on Expenditures. I quote, Mr. President, from his statement before the committee:

> In the second place, I suggest that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures be discontinued. This committee was established by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 "to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential.

Dr. Galloway continued, saying that—

> Its function overlaps that of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which, having been rejuvenated by the Legislative Reorganization Act, are now equipped to assume their historic responsibilities in this field.

Therefore, the continued existence of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is a violation of the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act, as well as a waste of the taxpayers' dollar.

I bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that here is a committee which, supposedly, by its title, is created to reduce expenditures and to eliminate waste, but I charge that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money and is a fundamental violation of the purpose of the committee.

The only reports which this joint committee has produced are monthly personnel statistics, which are prepared largely at the expense of the executive agencies themselves, and the cost of preparation has been estimated at a quarter of a million dollars for an 8-year period.

Recalling that its function is spelled out as "making a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential," we find that it has devoted itself almost exclusively to personnel statistics, and that without any justification whatsover it has regularly issued general statements calling for blanket reductions in Federal personnel. Even the most naive management engineering firm would never think of making recommendations concerning personnel reductions without

submitting detailed reasons for such reductions consistent with disclosed facts, and indicating where they should take place.

Yet, Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures in the Federal Government has not submitted a detailed documented statement as to why it believes the Federal employee rolls should be reduced. It merely makes a blanket charge, in the name of what it calls economy, that there should be a drastic reduction in personnel.

I also submit, Mr. President, that these blanket charges are often given the notoriety of newspaper headlines, indicating to the American electorate that the reductions are essential and that there is great waste going on in the Federal Government. To be sure, there may be some waste, but the charge of waste should be fully documented, and the documentation, I submit, has not been presented by reports of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures.

Mr. President, I submit that the continued existence of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is a wanton waste and extravagance, and that the expenditure of, first, over $100,000 in appropriated funds; second, $250,000 worth of time and effort of the executive branch of the Government in compiling the joint committee data; and, third, undetermined additional funds for printing, is unwarranted, and stands as the No. 1 example of waste and extravagance which the joint committee itself should have recommended be eliminated.

It is my firm conviction that this committee serves no useful purpose, and is merely used as a publicity medium. It deals only in generalities and violates the purpose for which it was created by wasting public funds rather than conserving them. Its demands on Federal agencies for monthly detailed personnel data is a heavy expense that must be borne by the executive branch with no return being made for the time and funds consumed in the compilation of such reports.

It is high time that certain elements in the legislative branch abandon their punitive attitude toward executive departments and agencies, and in turn that the executive departments and agencies develop a conscientious, cooperative attitude toward the legislative branch.

Since coming to the Senate just about a year ago I have been invited many times to indulge myself in one of two very popular indoor sports currently practiced by Members of the Congress and the executive branch. To date I have refused to become a participant, and today I shall assume the role of critic of these sports.

The first sport is known as persecute and prosecute, and is indulged in by legislators when dealing with members of the executive branch. This is strictly a punitive game with everyone concerned the loser, the legislator, the executive, and the department or agency.

The other sport is known as button, button, who has got the button, and is indulged in exclusively by members of the executive branch, as a defense mechanism against the punitive methods of the legislative branch. This is a game of concealment, containment, evasion, and misrepresentation, and again everyone is generally the loser, and no one the winner.

Mr. President, may I suggest that in the interest of better government, and particularly in the interest of better relations between the legislative and executive branches that these sports be forever barred from use, and that since the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures is one of those that has most frequently indulged itself in one of these sports, that it also be barred from participation by dissolvement.

The continued existence of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is not conducive to the success of our efforts for the reduction of Federal expenditures, to which many Members of this body are committed, and I cannot urge too strongly that this joint committee and its wasteful activities be abolished. I hope that other Senators will join with me in protesting the allocation of further funds for this joint committee, and in the passage of the bill I have introduced providing for its abolition.

Mr. President, I ask that the other Members of this great body join with me in strengthening the standing committee rejuvenated by the act of 1946 which would have the responsibility for watching over whatever waste or extravagance there may be in the Federal Government and bringing to the attention of the Congress of the United States means and methods of economy and efficiency of operation in the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask for its appropriate reference. It provides for the repeal of section 601, title 6, of the Revenue Act of 1941, pertaining to a committee to investigate Federal expenditures, and for other purposes, and I ask that the bill be given, as quickly as possible, consideration by the appropriate committee. Let those who talk so much about economy and do so little about it make the first all-important move toward economy by abolishing a committee which has no right to exist, a committee which has merely existed because no one has spoken up to ask that it be dissolved, a committee which violates the Reorganization Act. I ask that it be done in the name of economy, so we can positively say we have really made a start on economy. I ask that it be done in the name of sound legislative practice, whereby standing committees of the Senate perform the duties assigned to them.

The bill (S. 3116) providing for the repeal of section 601, title VI, of the Revenue Act of 1941, pertaining to the Committee to Investigate Federal Expenditures, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TRANSFER OF PLANES TO CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain newspaper articles regarding the award to the Chinese Communists yesterday by the British Hong Kong court of 71 airplanes belonging to the company operated by Gen. Claire Chennault.

The first insertion is an article from the New York World-Telegram dated February 23.

The second is a dispatch from Hong Kong by the noted New York Times world correspondent, Burton Crane, dealing with the same subject.

The third is an article which appears in today's Washington News entitled "China Reds Can't Wait To Grab Chennault's Planes," by Oland D. Russell, and an editorial which appears on the opposite side of the same paper under the headline, "How can we win?"

I also wish to have included a press dispatch which has just come over one of the tickers in our lobby.

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

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

HONG KONG.—Chinese Communist officials began taking over Nationalist property in Hong Kong today on the strength of a supreme-court decision granting them 71 former Nationalist airplanes.

A small vanguard moved into the offices of the Central Trust, an organ of the Nationalist Government, and began examining records.

Other Nationalists' properties scheduled to be taken over by the Communists include a number of banks, a shipping line with about 300,000 tons of ships in operation, and the Nationalist consular offices.

A Communist spokesman said the 71 planes granted them yesterday will be used to establish regular air service between Hong Kong and Communist China shortly.

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 23, 1950]

REDS AWARDED CHINESE AIR LINE

HONG KONG, February 23.—The Hong Kong Supreme Court, dismissing a claim by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, today granted the Chinese Communist government possession of $20,000,000 in Chinese Nationalist air lines' equipment.

The equipment included some ground equipment and 40 transport and passenger planes owned by the China National Aviation Corp. and the Central Air Transport Corp.

General Chennault claimed the planes for his Civil Air Transport Co. on grounds he had bought up all Hong Kong assets of the two Nationalist companies when they transferred operations to Formosa last fall.

CLAIMED BY REDS

General Chennault, wartime commander of the Flying Tigers, recently petitioned the court to appoint a receiver for the two air lines' property in Hong Kong.

The planes were taken over by the Hong Kong court last fall after a number of air crews of the CNAC and CATC defected and flew 11 planes to Communist territory.

The Chinese Communist regime at Peiping claimed the remainder of the planes on grounds they belonged to the Chinese people

and should be turned over to the Chinese Communist administration.

Pro-Communist air-line employees, anticipating the court's decision, have been painting red flags on the ships' fuselages and overhauling the engines during the past few weeks. It was expected they would be flown into Communist China within a few days.

The two Nationalist air lines fled Hong Kong last November in fear that Chinese Nationalist property here would be turned over to the Communists by the Hong Hong court.

Today's decision was the first in a number of pending cases. Other Nationalist property still in Hong Kong includes banks and shipping.

[From the New York Times of February 24, 1950]

HONG KONG COURT GIVES REDS PLANES—DENIES RECEIVERSHIP PLEA OF UNITED STATES CONCERN FOR 93 FORMER CHINESE NATIONALIST CRAFT—INJUNCTIONS ARE LIFTED—"SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY" CITED BY BENCH—ONLY REGISTRY BARS SHIPS' FLIGHT TO PEIPING

(By Burton Crane)

HONG KONG, February 23.—Under Hong Kong Supreme Court decision today, 93 planes, paid for largely by United States taxpayers, are being turned over to the Chinese Communist government.

Despite the decision, which denied a receivership application and vacated two injunctions granted last autumn, the Chinese Communists are unable at present to fly the planes to their territory. They are not registered under Hong Kong laws. Thus some time remains for possible action from Washington or elsewhere.

[According to the Associated Press, a spokesman for one of the air lines involved said the planes would be flown to Peiping, seat of the Chinese Communist government, probably within a week.]

The case concerned three corporations. The largest was the China National Aviation Corp., a prewar subsidiary of Pan American Airways. It was reincorporated in 1946, with the Chinese Nationalist Government taking 80 percent of the stock by virtue of its contribution of planes and equipment it received from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Economic Cooperation Administration. Lend-Lease, and other forms of United States aid.

The second concern, the Central Air Transport Corp., was owned 100 percent by the Nationalist Government's Communications Ministry.

When the Communists began to overrun China both companies removed their planes to the Kaitak Airport in Hong Kong. Eighty percent of the Chinese employees of both air lines defected to the Communists last November 9 and flew away several planes.

The two corporations asked the protection of the British Government, which then still recognized the Chinese Nationalist regime. The corporations were told they would get protection if they first applied for an injunction, according to Richard Heppner, one of the lawyers representing Nationalist and United States interests in the case. Mr. Heppner was wartime head of the Office of Strategic Services in China and a law partner of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, retired, over-all head of the OSS.

The two Nationalist Government air lines asked and got an injunction forbidding the defecting employees to touch the planes, which include four Skymasters and six Convairs. Shortly thereafter the Communists got an injunction preventing Nationalist sympathizers from going near the equipment.

Mr. Heppner declared tonight that the Americans and the Chinese Nationalist involved in the case had objected strongly because only the second injunction ever was enforced. Communists were permitted to work on the planes and service them, he said, and the British refused to withdraw the airfield passes issued to the Communists as employees even though they had announced they were no longer connected with the two concerns.

Early last November, the Nationalist Government attempted to extricate itself from this dilemma by selling all planes of both air lines to Civil Air Transport, Inc., a Delaware concern formed for that purpose by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault and his associate, Whiting Willauer. Civil Air Transport declared in court that it had paid $3,900,000 for the planes of the first two companies.

On January 6 Britain recognized the Chinese Communist Government shortly after inspectors from the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority appeared with an announcement that the former Central Air Transport and China National Aviation planes had been registered by Civil Air Transport with the United States Government. They said they wished to inspect the planes and place United States markings on them. British authorities refused to allow them to tamper with the planes.

Civil Air Transport then filed applications with the Hong Kong courts for the appointment of receivers for both companies.

Today, Sir Leslie Gibson, Hong Kong's chief justice, handed down a decision declaring that the "doctrine of sovereign immunity operates to prevent the court from entertaining an application to appoint a receiver." He also declared that all proper parties were not before the court and that the plaintiff corporation had not established a sufficiently strong case.

"I have held that the assets are in possession of the Central People's Government (Communists)," he said. "If I am wrong in this, then, in my opinion, they are clearly in possession of the corporation (China National Aviation). Neither the Central People's Government nor the corporation is a party to these proceedings or has consented to the appointment of a receiver."

The Chief Justice dismissed the American contention that the Communist government had got possession only through infringing the November injunction and declined to admit the validity of the minutes of China National Aviation of December 31, approving the sale to Civil Air Transport. The court ordered the plaintiffs to pay $8,000 as costs.

According to the Nationalists' intelligence, possession of the planes will triple the Communist air force.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1950]

CHINA REDS CAN'T WAIT TO GRAB CHENNAULT PLANES

(By Oland D. Russell)

The Chinese Communists were expected to lose no time in flying out of Hong Kong the 70-odd transport planes which have in effect been handed over to them by the supreme court in the British crown colony.

The planes, including communications and maintenance equipment, belong to an American corporation, headed by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame.

They make up the biggest air fleet in China and for months have been sought by the Chinese Communists. They can be used to ferry military supplies to China from Russia, for dropping parachutists into Indochina, or for an amphibious assault on Formosa.

The Hong Kong court invoked sovereign immunity in deciding it could not take the planes under its protection by appointing a receiver for them. The court took the view that since the British had recognized the Communists, the Peiping regime was the legal and sovereign ruler of China and could not be disturbed from its possession of the planes.

ALREADY, RED FLAGS

Though the American owners and representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority have been denied the access to the planes, pro-Communist employees of the two former Nationalist air lines have been permitted to board them at Kaitak Airfield where they are impounded. Anticipating a court decision in favor of the Communists, those former employees already have painted Red flags on the ships and have been overhauling the motors in preparation for a quick getaway.

British authorities in Hong Kong have been trying for 3 months—even before London recognized the Red regime—to find a legal way of turning over these two completely equipped air lines to the Chinese Communists.

Communist pressure on the local British authorities has been great and the British themselves have not been unmindful of the trade benefits and good will that might accrue to them if they handed over the planes to the Commies.

Still other pressures have been exerted on the Hong Kong British by the London foreign office and the United States State Department for recognition of General Chennault's legal title to the planes.

GODOWN SHOW-DOWN

The show-down came this week. According to word received here, the Communists got word to the Hong Kong court that for every plane denied them, one British business establishment in Communist-occupied Shanghai would be taken over. "A godown (warehouse) for every plane," as the Reds tersely put it.

Facing this situation realistically, the Hong Kong court yielded to the Communists, taking advantage, according to observers here, of the British election following Washington's Birthday when communications with London and Washington would be at a minimum effectiveness.

The court in effect washed its hands of the whole affair, dumping a ticklish question on the London foreign office, but by choosing the holiday and election day period, it gave some time leeway to the Communists to get the planes away from Hong Kong.

If any restraint is now to be used, it will have to be done on orders from London for some sort of executive action.

AMERICAN REPRISALS

At stake now is whether American diplomatic power can be used effectively to prod London into measures which still might save some or all of the planes from falling into Communist hands. The State Department has, through representations and notes, backed the Chennault claim to title of the planes and has insisted that the Hong Kong court conduct a trial to establish legality of this title.

But Washington consistently has refused to get tough about it, with the result that the Communists have slugged it out—and apparently have won—in the Hong Kong courts.

Some demands were heard here yesterday for American reprisals against the British through the ECA. It was pointed out that the British by letting planes and equipment valued at $20,000,000 be grabbed off by the Communists, in effect have given an American air fleet to the Reds topping in value what the British will get in air equipment from the ECA.

[From the Washington Daily News of Februrary 24, 1950]

HOW CAN WE WIN?

Now that the United States and Britain have recognized the French-sponsored Bao Dai regime in Indo-China, French military circles are asking for a common western

policy in the Far East, as well as immediate military aid.

A list of the equipment wanted, including light tanks, jeeps, reconnaisance cars, and small-arms ammunition, has been given to our Government, with an additional request for a $100,000,000 economic rehabilitation loan.

Since we are here being asked to buy into a war, it will be well to get all the facts on the table. We ought to know what we're getting into, and just what chance, if any, we have to win. From this distance, the chance looks dim.

The French, having had an army of 160,000 men in the field for 3 years, have inflicted no serious injury to Ho Chi-minh's Communist forces. Now, according to a Paris report to the New York Times, "an effective blockade of Communist China" is regarded as one of the essentials if victory is to be achieved.

The idea of a blockade of Communist China can be discarded, now that the British court in Hong Kong has awarded the Red Government at Peiping 70 transport and passenger planes which Major General Chennault had purchased from the Chinese Nationalists. That decision probably spells the doom of Formosa, as well as killing any prospect of saving Indochina from the Reds.

Some heads should be examined in the State Department and the British Foreign Office. Britain recognized the Chinese Reds, and now has given them the planes they need to continue their campaign of aggression. The United States has recognized the Bao Dai forces in Indochina, and now is asked to put up the money and the arms to defeat the forces of Ho Chi-minh, which are said to have the active support of the Chinese Reds. Russia, of course, is backing both Red forces.

How can the West hope to win under this kind of leadership?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of Members of the Senate the fact that this is one of the greatest blows to the non-Communist world that has been delivered in that part of the globe. The granting of these 71 planes, which in equity belong to the firm of General Chennault, and before that belonged to the Nationalist Government of China, furnishes the Communists the tools which they can later use for an attack upon the island of Formosa, for an air-borne attack upon southeast Asia, and ultimately perhaps for an attack upon the islands of Japan or the Philippines.

I think that if the Government of Great Britain does not recognize its responsibility in this matter, and take immediate administrative steps to prevent those 71 planes, which are American planes, from getting into the hands of the Communists, the Government of the United States must itself take drastic action in that regard, in the way of representations to the British Government. The British can no longer expect assistance from us to help to stop communism in Europe while the British Government, by their recognition of the Communist regime, and by this latest action of turning over 71 planes, actually accelerate the spread of communism in Asia.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article appearing in Time magazine for February 27 dealing with the situation in Formosa.

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

CHINA BEFORE STORMS AND WINDS

Along south China's invasion coast, facing the Nationalist islands of Formosa and Hainan, Communist generals are drilling a million men, assembling thousands of junks and sampans for amphibious assault. How firmly will Nationalist China hold out in her island remnants? Last week Time Correspondent Wilson Fielder surveyed Fomosa's defenses. His report:

"In the foothills of southern Formasa's terraced mountains, youthful soldiers shout 'Sha! Sha!' (kill! kill!) as they lunge at practice dummies with bayonets. The huge military training camp at Fengshan echoes with machine-gun chatter, and squads of infantrymen work under live ammunition fire. Fengshan's combat course is modeled after the training system used in the United States in World War II, and the camp's officers call it "the cradle of the new Chinese army."

"From the training camp, troops graduate to the volcanic black sand beaches not far away. There, facing the mainland, they build concrete pillboxes, string barbed wire, drill endlessly to repel the invasion from the sea. In their off-duty hours, the soldiers sing a new army song:

" 'The fields of the Motherland are calling,
The blood of 500 million is throbbing,
Let storms and winds buffet us,
The goddess of Liberty is smiling,
We are the vanguard of antiaggression.' "

FROM VMI

The morale of the new Nationalist Army seems to be good, and officers credit the improvement to the work of trim, greying General Sun Li-jen, 49, who learned the elementary facts about soldiering at the United States' Virginia Military Institute. Sun served ably against the Japanese at Shanghai and later in Burma, where he commanded the snappy, United States trained Thirty-eighth Division. As one of the Nationalists' top commanders in Manchuria after VJ-day, he beat the Communists consistently. In 1947, Chinese clique politics led to his transfer to Formosa and the Fengshan training camp.

The islanders soon learned that Sun was no carpetbagger. He set up six "don'ts" for his troops: "Don't molest the populace; don't go to prostitutes; don't gamble; don't 'squeeze'; don't be false; don't be lazy." He asked Formosans to help enforce discipline. Villagers still talk about the lieutenant who walked the streets of the small towns near Fengshan carrying a big sign listing his crimes.

Sun learned more than discipline at VMI. He has an American zest for sport. Recently he took part in a Fengshan soccer game, told the other players: "On the playing field, I'm no general." An enlisted man bowled him over with a well-executed block. The general rose groggily. "Guess I'm not as young as I used to be," he said, but he insisted on finishing the game.

Last month the Nationalist Government offered 4,500 young Formosans a chance to serve in the island's defense, and thousands of volunteers were turned away. General Sun was heartened. With the troops he had already trained and those in training (well over 100,000), he feels that he can stand off at least the first waves of a Communist invasion. He has shaken up the officer corps, though too much deadwood still remains. He needs more matériel and more parts for vehicles. But he insists that his "boys are working like beavers because they know now what they are fighting for."

AGAINST DISAFFECTION

The Nationalists' 300-plane air force, commanded by amiable Gen. Chou Chih-jou, could be Formosa's most effective defense (so far, the Reds have fought without planes), but until recently Chou was plagued with disaffection among his airmen. Last week in Taipeh, Chou opened a lengthy "self-examination" meeting where airmen could talk over their personal worries with top brass. He is also promoting better housing for their families, now thinks that the morale problem is on the way to being solved.

Disaffection has also considerably weakened the Nationalist Navy. Following the lead of turncoat airmen, sailors have surrendered at least 12 ships (including the navy's only cruiser, the *Chungking*, formerly the British *Aurora*) to the Communists. To combat disloyalty chubby Admiral Kwei Yung-ching has clamped several senior captains in irons. He has also promoted relatively liberal pay raises, hopes that what is left of his navy is loyal.

CRUCIAL FRONT

Beyond its shaky defenses the specter that haunts Formosa is economic collapse. If Nationalist military expenditures cannot be held within the limits of Formosa's productive capabilities, the Communists might just as well be invited to come on over unopposed. As General Sun says, "If prices double, we get just half the food we need for our men. What do you think will happen if we can't feed our men and their families?"

The commander on the economic front is indefatigable, Princeton-trained Gov. K. C. Wu, former mayor of Shanghai. To set a good example, Chain Smoker Wu gave up cigarettes because "cigarettes are smuggled into Formosa, and represent, therefore, a drain on our financial structure." Since he became Formosa's governor last December Wu has stopped speculation with government pay rolls by military and civilian bureaucrats. He has tried resolutely to tap wealth. Automobiles have been classed as luxuries, and their owners must now buy a certain amount of war bonds; residents applying for passports must purchase bonds equal to the amount of their transportation costs; taxes on restaurant meals and motion pictures have been upped from 20 to 60 percent.

The real key to a stable economy is industrial expansion. In this field Wu is pressing as hard as he can with the limited means at his disposal. Formosa's power plants have reached the peak levels of production achieved under the Japanese. Cement production has surpassed the best Japanese mark. The island's meager foreign exchange has been reinvested in irrigation projects for richer crops. But even the most enthusiastic Nationalist admits that all of this will eventually come to naught unless Formosa receives more financial and technical aid from the United States.

Like other Nationalist leaders, honest Governor Wu is conscious that the United States Government, to put it kindly, is impatient with Nationalist shortcomings. He answers, "When your heart is for reform, you must sometimes be patient." And if the Reds take Formosa as they have taken China, what price reform?

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. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there are pending before the Senate several amendments to the pending resolution, and I desire at this time to offer another amendment to the so-called potato amendment, and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "the

enactment of this joint resolution" and insert "March 15, 1950."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered amends the same line of the bill which the pending amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes to amend. I assume, therefore, that the Senate will vote first on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. However, I have sent my amendment to the desk and asked that it be read, in order that Senators may have before them at the time they vote on the Williams amendment an alternate proposal.

I make parliamentary inquiry as to which of these amendments takes priority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assumed that would be the case.

Mr. President, I wish now to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the so-called Lucas amendment to the pending cotton joint resolution is aimed at partially correcting a most unfortunate situation growing out of the bill providing price support for potatoes. As I stated on the floor yesterday, when the Senator from Illinois was kind enough to yield to me, his amendment creates some inequalities, plus some additional difficulties of administration.

So there are pending before the Senate now, Mr. President, four different proposals. First, there is the Lucas amendment, which provides that there shall be no support for any potatoes planted after the joint resolution becomes law. We do not know exactly when that will be. When we pass the joint resolution it will go to the House. We may assume that the House will not accept the Senate amendments, and will ask for a conference. The House will appoint conferees, and the Senate will appoint conferees. The conferees will meet. After several days of deliberation, perhaps, they will agree on a report. The report will go back, first to the body in which the bill originated. In this case the House would vote first on the conference report. If adopted by the House, the conference report will come to the Senate, and the Senate will vote on it. If the Senate adopts the report, it will go to the White House for the signature of the President. He will have 10 days in which to have the Department of Agriculture, and anybody else he might think should be advised with, consulted about proposed changes in the general farm-support program. So it is quite difficult to say when the joint resolution will become law. It is fair to say, however, that it might easily be 2 weeks—and perhaps longer—before it will become law. However, the very minute it becomes law, under the Lucas amendment no potatoes planted the next minute can get any support.

We have pending before us an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which provides that no potatoes harvested after the joint resolution becomes law shall have any support. That ignores the fact, apparently, if we are to try to do complete justice to the whole situation, that potatoes have been in the markets from Florida since early January, and by the time the joint resolution becomes law the bulk of the Florida crop will have been harvested. The so-called Williams amendment unintentionally draws a cut-off line just north of Florida. The Lucas amendment draws a cut-off line about 25 miles south of Chesapeake Bay, leaving out that great and wonderful potato-producing area in Norfolk and Princess Anne Counties on the Virginia side, and Northampton and Accomack Counties on the peninsular, or Eastern Shore side, of Virginia. Those counties surround Chesapeake Bay. But the Lucas amendment cuts a little south of them, and does a nice job for North Carolina and everything south of North Carolina. But it leaves this particular potato area out of the picture.

I admit, Mr. President, it is not an easy thing to find a perfect solution for the potato problem. In fact, it is but a part of a much larger problem for which we do not have an adequate solution. There is one solution of the farm problem to which we in the United States must eventually give more consideration. When the Marshall plan ends in the fiscal year 1952 our American farmers are going to lose an export market of more than $1,000,000,000 a year. Everyone knows that we have not worked out a satisfactory solution of the farm problem even with the give-away program of the ECA. Of course, the people of those foreign nations could have eaten all our surplus potatoes, and would have been very glad to have obtained them, but apparently we did not have the shipping necessary, and the transportation of the potatoes might have required the use of refrigerator ships. I do not know what the problem was by reason of which the Secretary of Agriculture said that about 50,000,000 bushels of a very wonderful food had to be destroyed. In fact, it is the type of food which is eaten practically all over the world, although in some of the southern countries they use a little different variety, which we call the sweetpotato or the yam; but potatoes of some kind seem to be pretty nearly a world-wide food in civilized countries.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Virginia informed that since that announcement, whenever it was made by the Secretary of Agriculture, a very large volume, amounting to thousands of tons of the surplus potatoes, has already been taken by our foreign friends in Portugal, in Spain, in Greece, in Morocco, and other countries? Therefore it seems as though a very large proportion will be utilized in one manner or another rather than to be dumped, which I think is a matter of gratification to everyone.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course, there is so much hunger and distress in the world it is most repugnant to every American to see food needlessly destroyed and wasted. I have read in the newspapers that some of these nations were willing, at the nominal price at which the potatoes had been offered for sale, to buy a considerable quantity, but the delivery was dependent upon their securing ocean transportation, and apparently there was some doubt about the quantity of potatoes which could be delivered before the weather became so warm they would spoil.

Mr. BREWSTER. The ships are now coming to the Atlantic coast to take these potatoes. It is quite practical to ship potatoes from the northern ports for another month or two.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That, of course, is somewhat encouraging, because it means all the potatoes will not be lost.

Mr. President, I think I should now mention the substitute for the three pending amendments, which would come to a vote when either the Williams amendment or my amendment is adopted or rejected. Then we would come to the substitute for the whole measure, offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. That substitute provides that instead of having a cut-off date or a cut-off line here, there, or yonder, all potatoes will come under the program, provided the Department of Agriculture will put in a compulsory form of acreage control and marketing agreements.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont if he wants me to do so. Do I understand from the author of the substitute that its provisions have been correctly stated by me?

Mr. AIKEN. I just came into the Senate Chamber.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I stated that the Senator's substitute provides that all potatoes this year, regardless of when planted or when harvested, would come under the support program provided the Secretary of Agriculture put into effect a compulsory allotment and marketing control.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have stated the four proposals which are before the Senate. I feel that in the interest of fairness and justice to my constituents, I owed it to them, before action was taken on the Lucas amendment and on the Williams amendment, to offer the amendment which I sent to the desk, and on which I will ask for a vote as soon as the Senate has voted on the Williams amendment. My amendment strikes out the language of the Lucas amendment in line 12 on page 7 which provides that potatoes which are planted after the joint resolution becomes law shall be out, and inserting the provision that potatoes planted after March 15, 1950, shall be out.

In this connection I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that during the past year the Government lost very little on the early potatoes, and at the present time, of course, is not losing anything on the Florida new potatoes. Yet I frankly admit that if the Government had not taken up the Maine and Idaho potatoes and other thick-skinned winter potatoes, rather than having them dumped on our southern markets at whatever the market would pay, the Florida producers would not have secured cost of production for what they were selling, because the other potatoes would have been so much cheaper, even though some people like the little marblelike

potatoes which can be boiled. They would have used the winter-grown potatoes, because price is a factor. So the whole problem, I submit, is closely interrelated.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia is informed that the Government is buying Florida potatoes at the present time to the extent of several thousand bushels a day in order to support the market? That, I think, affords an interesting observation on the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was under the impression that the Government was not buying the Florida potatoes at the present time.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Government has been buying them for some time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I may be misinformed. The Senator from Maine, of course, is a potato expert, and I do not claim to be one. No doubt he has kept in closer touch with the situation than I have. If he says that the Government is now buying Florida potatoes, far be it from me to say that he does not know what he is talking about. But I say it can be seen how palpably unfair it is, if the Government is now buying Florida potatoes, for the Lucas amendment to be adopted, since it says, "We will add to the other potatoes the Carolina potatoes." And if the Mississippi potatoes, or Georgia potatoes, or wherever else in that region potatoes are grown, are included, the potatoes grown in the area up to Chesapeake Bay will be taken in, but potatoes will be cut off at that Chesapeake Bay line. I say I do not see the justice of such action.

Let us include them up to the March 15 period. That will do what? It will take care of the early spring potatoes, even those in California, which really have given us in Virginia sharp competion. The California potatoes come on the market at the same time as our Virginia potatoes do. The California potatoes are a little larger, but more watery than ours. However, they are packaged and well graded, and they give us tough competition.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator not realize that the sun moves north, and does not recognize any geographical boundary at all? I certainly appreciate the force of the argument made by the Senator from Virginia, who does not want Virginia potatoes eliminated. That reminds me of the story of the farmer who said he didn't want very much land; he just wanted what "j'ined" his.

I am sure the people just north of Virginia will be equally interested because in the latter part of March and in the early part of April potatoes will be planted in Maryland and further north.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But I remind my colleague of the fact that in Aroostook County, Maine, the farmers grow a thick-skinned potato which can stand adversity. Our little thin-skinned potatoes cannot take as much rough treatment. They do not keep very long. Aroostook potatoes raised and harvested the previous fall can even be sent down to us in March as seed potatoes to be planted for our fall potatoes.

There is this much more. We evidently have to work out a general farm program.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let us be frank about the matter. We cannot go ahead with a 90-percent support program and practically unlimited production, with surplus piling up, and a potentiality of two or three or four billion dollars a year of support by reason of surpluses we do not know what to do with. This is the most acute part of the situation. We do not have a full remedy, but I am offering a very minor amendment to the pending amendment which I think, pending a more permanent and better adjustment, would at least do justice and be fair to the early crop of potatoes clear across the board from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean. My amendment would take them all in. Then I shall be glad to join with my distinguished colleagues from the colder area to work out a program to take care of the whole situation.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Virginia did not intend to leave any implication that potatoes were receiving 90 percent support now, did he?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. I was talking about the 90-percent support provision which was adopted over my protest and over my vote at the time of adjournment last October, which was continued on the insistence of the House for another year on certain basic crops. That could amount to a very large sum of money. But that was for only 1 year.

Mr. BREWSTER. But potatoes came under the 60-percent support program last year, and we are still operating under the 60-percent program. Potatoes are the only major crop—I do not say basic crop but major crop—as to which that is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The potato growers tell me that at current prices they do not receive the cost of production, in view of the present price of fertilizer and the high cost of living. If they were to get $2 a hundred pounds, they might come out all right. Last year, when they got $2.40 a hundred pounds, I am informed they made a little profit on the potatoes they sold to the Government. However, the present support price merely serves to minimize the potato farmer's loss. That is the situation in Virginia.

For some reason—I do not know whether it is because there is better land in Maine or whether the Maine farmers are smarter, or what the reason is—in Maine more potatoes are produced to the acre than in Virginia. I think the Senator from Maine knows that is true. I think there are cases in Maine, particularly in Aroostook County, where the production is four times as great as it is in Virginia; and that situation makes a considerable difference.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate further on this matter. The amendment is simply stated, but of course some of our simplest problems are the hardest to solve. I confess I do not know the real answer. However, I am offering an amendment which in my opinion will make the Lucas amendment, should it be the will of the Congress, fairer than it is at the present time, for my amendment will apply clear across the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, on the March 15 date, which will take care of every farmer who raises potatoes which come on the market in June.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks in connection with the farm program.

There has been much discussion of the farm support program and the impression has been created that this is costing the Government a tremendous sum of money, and many questions have been raised as to the advisability of continuing price support for farm products generally.

I think it would be well to get a clear picture of just what has happened in connection with the farm support of prices. As to the benefit which the farmers have reaped from this program, I need only say that the total income of the farmers in America in 1933 was only $7,000,000,000, in round figures, whereas in 1948 it amounted to $35,000,000,000.

The prosperity of the country depends in a very large measure upon the prosperity of the farmers, and the money spent by the Government in support of farm prices has been returned manifold to the Government in taxes paid by farmers and in the general contribution made by farmers to the total prosperity of the Nation.

The present measure relating to the allotment of cotton acreage is both necessary and essential, and it is important that it be passed without delay. It is an emergency measure; and for that reason, I favored considering it on its own merits, without having the issue confused by injecting into the consideration of this measure the potato amendment or amendments touching other farm products.

It will be recalled that last year the cotton-acreage allotment bill provided for the reduction of cotton acreage from 27,000,000 to 21,000,000 acres for 1950. That was a very decided cut, but one that was fully justified; and the cotton farmer has made no objection to this reduction in acreage, but has agreed to accept it as a necessary protection for preventing the accumulation of an unnecessarily large surplus.

When the allotments were made, however, the Agriculture Department proceeded upon the basis of its Bureau of Agricultural Economics report as to the acreage planted to cotton in the various States and in the counties of the several States. That report was not accurate. As a result of that and other provisions in connection with acreage allotments, a great many inequalities and injustices resulted, so that many farmers

suffered a reduction of 40 percent, 50 percent, and sometimes nearly 100 percent in their acreage, whereas the across-the-board reduction was supposed to be around 20 percent.

This measure is for the purpose of correcting some of these inequalities and injustices. Unless it is passed, many farmers will be denied their just rights, by virtue of the method in which acreage allotments have been made. This measure does not give as much increased acreage for the purpose of adjusting these inequalities as was proposed in the House measure, but it will afford substantial relief, and will not add more than probably six or seven hundred thousand acres to the total, and will still leave the number of acres actually planted to cotton below the 21,000,000 authorized in the allotment bill last year.

In this connection, I think it should be known that this price-support program for cotton has been in effect for about 16 years; and during this entire period, up to December 31, 1949, the entire cotton support-price program has not cost the taxpayers a single cent. Instead of the Governments losing money on the cotton program, it made a net profit, as of the first of the year, of $236,359,485. In view of these facts, no one could have any just complaint about the small measure of relief this measure will give the cotton farmers.

In this connection, I may say that another very important crop which has benefited from Government price support, and which likewise has not cost the taxpayers a single cent during the 16 years it has been administered, is the tobacco program. Instead of the Government's losing any money on the tobacco program, which has been one of the best administered programs in the entire farm schedule, there was a net profit, for the Government, as of December 31, 1949, of $5,295,280.

Of course, other farm-support programs have lost money, and the taxpayers have suffered as a result; but these losses have not been anything as great as the public has been led to believe. For instance, the total loss on the wheat program up to December 31, 1949, for the whole period that this price-support has been in effect, was $40,597,175. On peanuts, the Government has lost $57,988,756 for the entire program, over the years.

The big loss has been in the potato program, and this is the one which has caused so much popular resentment. Up to December 31, 1949, the total loss on this program was $346,498,858.

It is generally admitted that the potato program has not been well handled. Many things have entered in to complicate this problem. The heaviest loss occurred last year. It arose because the crop was underestimated; and because of weather conditions, an exceptionally large crop developed. I realize the necessity of remedying this situation and of taking drastic action to prevent a recurrence of the waste which has developed by virtue of the destruction of so many potatoes for which the Government paid the support price.

The chief criticism results from the fact that instead of giving these potatoes to charitable organizations and making them available for use by relief agencies, hospitals, and other institutions, they have been permitted to go to waste or be destroyed or be sold for a penny a bushel and fed to cattle, although there was so much human need in the world. There is no defense for this situation.

The question now confronts us as to what remedy should be applied. I am going to support the Aiken amendment because I think it will enable the Agricultural Department to meet the present situation, and I do not believe we should take the proposed drastic action of repudiating the Government's contract with the farmers in the midst of the planting of their crops. I regard a contract with the Government as being as vital and as binding as a contract with an individual. This Government would not permit an individual to repudiate a contract with his Government, and therefore I do not believe the Government should repudiate its own contract with its citizens. We must maintain the integrity of the Government, even though some loss in dollars might occur as a result thereof.

I am definitely in favor of the legislation proposed for a strict and rigid potato control program for the future, but I think we should adopt the Aiken amendment now, and then follow it by the enactment of a control program that will give reasonable price support to the farmer and at the same time will lessen the cost to the Government and will make available to the relief agencies and other charitable organizations, both at home and abroad, the surplus potatoes, so that they may be utilized for human consumption, and not again have the spectacle of waste and extravagance which has been manifest in the present and past year.

I am very happy to say that the potato situation in North Carolina has resulted in very little, if any, loss to the Government, because our growers have strictly complied with the marketing agreements of the Agriculture Department and have sought to make the program work successfully. Our farmers have not overplanted. They have observed all the requirements in connection with the operation of the total potato program.

As to peanuts, it is gratifying, likewise, to know that the peanuts produced both in North Carolina and Virginia, known as edible peanuts, have cost the Government practically nothing in the way of support by prices. These have been selling above the support price practically all the time. Only about 15 percent of the cost of the peanut program has been attributable to peanuts grown in North Carolina and Virginia, which constitute the bulk of the edible peanuts produced in the United States. Peanuts grown in other sections are known as the oil-producing peanuts, and they sell at a lower price; and the loss in the operation of the program has occurred in connection with the marketing of these peanuts.

Upon the whole, the farm program has been a great success, and the price supports have enabled the farmers to realize a profit on the farm. Thus we have buttressed the prosperity of the Nation and have maintained our economy at a high level.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 398, which now is before the Senate, is proposed legislation of an emergency nature, as I see it.

In a very few weeks the farmers of South Carolina and of the entire Cotton Belt will be ready to plant their 1950 crop. In some States it will be even sooner.

This measure can mean the absolute livelihood of many farmers in the southeastern section of the United States.

There is no question in the minds of the farmers as to the value of this bill.

It will not cure all the inequities, but in my opinion, and in the opinion of the other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it will cure many more inequities than even the House joint resolution, because it uses a different method of determining the amount of acreage which was actually planted in the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, rather than taking without question the statistics of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The purpose of the pending joint resolution is to take care of the situation only where gross inequities now exist.

Last year when the present cotton-acreage allotment program went into effect, my office was flooded with mail. The cotton growers in South Carolina told me that their cotton allotments had been cut as much as 60 and 70 percent in some cases. Last year in my State the cotton crop was almost a 100-percent failure due to excess rainfall which brought on the boll weevils. As for the farmers who depend on cotton as their sole money crop, they were left in destitute circumstances. Many of them had borrowed money to buy fertilizer for the 1949 crop which failed to produce. Mr. President, today there are farmers in my State and in every State in the Cotton Belt who are wondering how they will be able to operate this year.

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, Public Law 38 was enacted, which set up a revolving fund for the Department of Agriculture to make disaster loans to farmers whose crops had been lost due to unpreventable conditions. Last year the entire State of South Carolina was included in the disaster area. This has been a tremendous help. This will help provide the farmers with money to buy fertilizer, but what good will fertilizer do if the farmers only have 5 or 6 acres allotted them in 1950 for cotton planting.

Mr. President, I well realize that we must have strict acreage control if the Government is to sponsor high-price support for cotton or any other commodity. I am for cotton support, but I want to remind you that cotton support is to assure the farmers of this Nation of a livelihood.

Twenty-one million acres have been allotted throughout the Nation under the present program. The Department of Agriculture estimates that under the existing law there will be planted approximately only 19,000,000 acres.

If House Joint Resolution 398, containing the Lucas amendment, is passed, the

Department of Agriculture estimates that an additional 800,000,000 acres will be added, but some have estimated that it will be much smaller than that amount. However, if it is passed, it will wipe out some of the gross inequities which are now in the program.

One of the main reasons for these inequities is the BAE figure which has been used in determining a farmer's allotment. It is known by the Department of Agriculture, the farmer, and by us that these figures are incorrect. They never should have been used in the first place. The way in which the BAE figures were obtained is in a great many instances responsible for the incorrectness of the figures. In my State 150,000 letters were sent to the farmers. Answers were received to approximately 20 percent of the letters. That percentage which was received were multiplied by 5, and the allotment was determined in that manner. In certain counties, of course, only the big farmers replied; in other counties the small farmers replied in big numbers. As a result of this hit and miss and guess on the part of the BAE, some of the farmers were cared for, while many others were not properly allotted acreage for the future.

The farmers should have been permited a chance to prove his cotton acreage history for the past 3 years. I refer only to those who have suffered gross inequities.

Mr. President, this joint resolution would give less than 800,000 additional acres to the Nation and these extra acres will go where they are justified and badly needed. It has been predicted by the Department of Agriculture that the total amount of cotton planted in the United States in 1950 including the extra acreage provided by this bill will fall short of the 21,000,000-acre national allotment.

What I am pointing out is that many farmers have been treated unjustly in the program. The bill being considered today, while adding very little to total national production, will correct many of the gross inequities. Every cotton grower who deserves it will be able to plant enough cotton for his tenants and his own family, too.

I call attention to the fact that it will assist the many very small farmers. A few moments ago I said it might be a matter of 5 or 6 acres. Some of them have been cut less than that. It will be said, "How can that be done when the joint resolution states that a farmer shall have 5 acres?" The answer is easy. Where the farmer-owner has tenant farmers under him, and in some instances can ration only 2, 3, or 4 acres to the tenant farmer. The joint resolution will assist many people, who now have allotted to them 3, 4, and 5 acres. It will give them probably 1, 2, or 3 acres additional, and will be their salvation during the coming year.

The Agricultural Committee has reported the joint resolution, as amended, by unanimous vote. This amendment was first introduced in the Senate under joint sponsorship of Senators EASTLAND, MCCLELLAN, HILL, STENNIS, and myself, and the substance of it now replaces the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Cotton Council support the provisions of this bill. Mr. Walter L. Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, said in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee that the provisions of this bill would give sufficient relief to the cotton farmers while the House bill goes too far and does an injustice to the majority of those farmers who would not benefit from the extra acreage proposed in the House bill. It should be clear in your minds that this bill is necessary for the economy of the farmers. We in the Senate Agriculture Committee, by the adoption of the Senate version of the cotton-acreage allotment bill, have cut the extra acreage from 1,400,000 acres to less than 800,000 acres.

Another advantage in this bill is that it can be worked in the years to come. If the joint resolution, as amended by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, is not passed, we shall have the same problem in the future.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will be glad to yield to the able Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad the Senator from South Carolina has brought out the fact that the Senate bill is an attempt at a permanent solution to the cotton-acreage problem. As the Senator well knows, the permanence of this proposed legislation, which he has worked on so diligently and faithfully on the Senate Committee on Agriculture, is one of the best aspects of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad also the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out the aid and assistance that this amended bill gives to the small farmer. As he has so pointed out, in many areas of his State there are many farmers who grow less than 5 acres of cotton. Under the bill as passed last fall, small farmers who have one or two tenants on their farms and grow in excess of 5 acres of cotton were so discriminated against that many of their tenants were forced to move and seek employment elsewhere in his State. The Senator has just ably presented this subject, but I wanted to voice my concurrence and point out that the same situation which exists in South Carolina also obtains in my State. I want to take this occasion to express my sincere thanks to the Senator from South Carolina for the earnest and hard way in which he has worked to be helpful to the small farmers of his State and to other States with identical problems. The very able Senator from South Carolina has been particularly helpful in bringing this controversy to a successful and quick conclusion, for the Senator knows that both in his State and throughout the Cotton Belt the farmers will have to start planting their cotton very soon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; it is so close to planting time that I think we ought to stay here in the Senate all night if necessary to get this bill passed and to send it to conference so that it can become law within the next few days.

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly agree with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As the very able Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, if the amended joint resolution can be enacted, it will be a great step, not only toward the relief of the cotton growers but toward a better program for next year and years to come. If we find that we want to reduce the acreage, we probably can do it. The easy way to do it is on a percentage basis.

The continual debate about cotton acreage will be eliminated to a large extent. The farmers will benefit each year from the provisions of this bill and the cotton-acreage-allotment program will be set forth to the Department of Agriculture, and it will be a problem solved to a very large extent in the years to come.

Hundreds of tenant farmers have been asked to leave by the land owners. These people have no place to go. This bill, which would only in a very small way, if any, impair the cotton support and control program in the years to come, means the absolute existence of many families in the Cotton Belt.

Planting time is just around the corner. It is very important to farm economy that this bill be enacted at the earliest moment.

This is true because the farmer, whether landlord or tenant, must prepare now for the planting of the cotton; he must make arrangements to borrow money with which to finance him during the year. The House joint resolution containing the Lucas amendment is, in my opinion, an emergency piece of legislation, and a good one, and should be passed immediately.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, certain communications, newspaper articles, and resolutions bearing on the subject of displaced persons.

There being no objection, the communications, newspaper articles, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENESEE MILK PRODUCERS' COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Batavia, N. Y., February 21, 1950.

Hon. Senator PATRICK D. MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read with particular interest in the February 19 issue of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, your stand on the entry of displaced persons into this country as written by Sigrid Arne of the Associated Press.

I agree wholeheartedly with your viewpoint. Out of 10 cases in this vicinity, including our own experience, only one seems to appreciate the opportunity offered by this country.

I could furnish in detail facts referred to in the article such as coming here under

false pretenses, have had little or no farm training and were unwilling to stay on such jobs, kicking about wages, and being told too rosy a story about living conditions in the United States.

It is my contention that American people should have some rights; that displaced persons who come to this country under false pretenses and who will not make good citizens should be deported. I believe that entry of displaced persons should be halted until a law has been made to that effect.

I am glad to know that there is one Senator who is aware of the danger of these dissatisfied displaced persons and is taking a definite stand about it.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES B. BROOKS.

ALTADENA, CALIF., *February 20, 1950.*

Hon. PATRICK MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: A great many of us want to send thanks to you for your able handling of the DP situation. If you could keep all of them out for several years, that would be a great benefit in many ways.

Frankly, while it may be true that we might find some desirable people in the many that might come in, we feel that you are absolutely right, very right, that too many undesirables are coming in. In a recent shipment of over 300 that came in here, practically all of them were listed as gardeners. That was the joke, because they were dancers and writers and actors for the movie center in Hollywood, and most of them had plenty of money, buying properties here and paying cash. The first part was from the papers giving their pictures and their true activities, the latter part from real-estate dealers.

We feel and believe that most of these people have low standards of morality and do not make good citizens. We judge of all that from their statements. And from what little we hear of your hearings, you have already found that out.

Is it possible to obtain a copy of the proceedings of your committee? Would appreciate a copy when the hearings are finished. You are doing a great job. Keep it up.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. SCHERER.

P. S.—Another thing, these DP's are taking jobs away from veterans who are unemployed, and they are taking houses that veterans and others would be glad to have. There is a whole subdivision near Long Beach, Calif., that was started as a rental section shortly after the war, and now the tenants have to move as the houses are being sold at about double their worth. Who gets them? Ha!

PAST DEPARTMENT COMMANDERS'
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
SONS OF UNION VETERANS
OF THE CIVIL WAR,
Easthampton, Mass., February 20, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just received a copy of your address in the Senate on January 6, 1950, regarding the displaced persons and the problems that have arisen in connection with their being admitted into this country.

I sincerely hope that your several investigations will prove beyond a doubt to your colleagues in the Senate that House bill 4567 should not be enacted by your august body.

We who love America and its many advantages do not want to jeopardize our national and natural way of living by the admittance of those who will be trained to destroy all we hold as truly the American way of life.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for a copy of this address and that your efforts will not go unrewarded.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. EMERY,
National President.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *February 17, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Thought you might be interested in the letter, Report on DP's, in the current issue of the Tablet, Catholic weekly of Brooklyn and Long Island.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. SCANLAN.

[From the Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y., February 18, 1950]

FIGURES ON DP'S

DEAR SIR: From its office at 80 Centre Street, New York, N. Y., the New York State Committee on Displaced Persons has issued an information bulletin of some 22 pages. Its contents covers the characteristics of DP's settling in New York State from October 1948 to October 1949. There is full information concerning the marital status, sex, age, country of birth, size of family, schooling, occupations, and assurances of these new immigrants. Undoubtedly many of your readers will be interested in this report which can be had for a penny post card.

I should like to point out what appears to me to be significant omission of characteristics, namely, that of religion. Most of us average citizens will recall the campaign waged against the 1948 DP law, not by persons like myself who favor limiting immigration, but rather by those who say they want to liberalize this law and our general immigration laws. It was said again and again, by leading names of all political parties in our State, by other important persons, and most of the press that the 1948 law discriminated against Catholics and Jews. Perhaps it some day will be realized that the originators of this vicious campaign of falsehood and vilification were none other than the Communists and fellow travelers.

In view of the above, maybe some of our State legislators can tell us why the "religious characteristics" were omitted from the report. In view of rising popular sentiment against communism, I think the citizenry of our State would be interested in knowing how many God-fearing people are among our new settlers.

Of the 100,000 DP's who entered our country during the above period, 28,941, or approximately 29 percent, came to this State. Of our total, 7,168 settled up-State and 21,773 settled in New York City. As I stated in my letter which was published in the Tablet of September 11, 1948: "Furthermore, one of the reasons for the disastrous housing situation is the fact that too many refugees and displaced persons already have settled in New York City."

I think it's about time to call a halt.

JOHN L. SCANLAN.

FEBRUARY 21, 1950.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I would like to enter a protest against DP's being admitted to our country during these unsettled times.

My husband was born and raised in this country and yet it is impossible for him to get a job. He has been unemployed since October 15, 1949. In one instance, I know he could have a job, if it were not for two DP's who are working there. We have been living on unemployment insurance and also on our savings of a few hundred dollars, which was to have been a down payment on a home this spring.

I have a son who just graduated from high school and can't get a job.

I say keep the DP's out and take care of our own people first.

My husband and I were married the year of the depression—we struggled through that period and raised a family—and now, when our goal was in sight, it has been swept away again.

I realize I am not the only one in this situation, but I want to get on my own two feet and stay there. It's up to you gentlemen in the Senate to help Americans first.

Yours truly,

(MRS.) MARIE BANNAN.

WOODSIDE, N. Y.

JAMES DISTILLERY, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., January 23, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Copy of the statement, made by you regarding displaced persons, received. I am enclosing copy of a letter which I sent to our Maryland Senators and which is self-explanatory.

I applied for two families of displaced persons the latter part of 1948 to work on my farm, Goldsborough Hall, Kent Island, Md. The tenant houses provided for the families are well furnished and have all modern conveniences. My farm manager did all possible for their welfare and contentment. Consequently, I feel certain that they planned to stay only long enough to become acclimated to our country and then seek employment in the city. The situation is unfortunate, when you consider the expense in preparing for them.

Respectfully,

FELIX V. GOLDSBOROUGH.

JANUARY 23, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR: If I am not mistaken, there is a bill now pending in Congress to increase the number of displaced persons to entry in our country. I want to vigorously protest the passage of this measure unless the method in assigning these families is entirely changed.

The families should be properly culled, so that when one applies for a farmer he will not get a shoemaker, and conversely. What is happening now, people are being sent to farms that know nothing of farm life, and do not want to know about it. Their only thought seems to be to stay long enough to gain sufficient information to know how to make a change. This is not right as far as the displaced persons are concerned, and it certainly is not proper treatment for those of us who are willing to take them in, giving them a home with all comforts and going to the expense of teaching them how to farm, only to learn, later, that they are dissatisfied and preparing to leave.

As an illustration, I have two families of displaced persons—the first family came on February 3, 1949, and are preparing to leave the 1st of this February. The reason, the son and daughter, who are 17 years and 16 years, respectively, desire to come to the city. Their father, who is a good worker, seems to have little or no control over them or his wife, who is equally as guilty in her desire to create discontentment. The second family, who came to me on March 10, 1949, seems to be very much more contented, although the first family is doing everything possible to create discontentment.

In the tenant houses that I had reconditioned for their comfort they have bathrooms, electricity, gas ranges, and even a radio, and are well furnished. So I have gone to considerable expense. Now, in addition to the necessity of having them properly placed, or culled, there should be some plan whereby they would spend at least 2 years with the ones to whom they are assigned, unless it could be shown that they were not getting proper treatment.

This family is leaving me to come to Baltimore in the hope of getting suitable employment. I think all will agree that the labor

situation here, for our own people, is none too good, and they, apparently, will have to be a burden to someone, to say nothing of the fact that if they do get employment, they will be taking the place of others.

I merely bring all of this to your attention because I believe it is a serious situation, and I do not believe that those of us that have been willing to open our doors to these displaced persons should be subjected to such treatment.

Respectfully,

FELIX V. GOLDSBOROUGH.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., January 24, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: We have received your letter and separate enclosure of displaced-persons statement.

We have brought this matter to the attention of our posts and at this very moment are conducting an intensified campaign tied in with the recent suicide of a veteran in this city.

It is our hope that this tragic circumstance will bring home to our citizens the inequities caused by the displaced-persons program.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

DANIEL H. BURKHARDT,
Department Adjutant.

JAMAICA, N. Y., *January 25, 1950.*

Hon. HERBERT LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am keenly aware of the bill before the Congress that would permit increasing the number of displaced persons to be brought to this country during 1951.

As a New Yorker yourself, you are undoubtedly well aware of the fact that there is an acute housing shortage in the city. There are many thousands of unemployed and several hundred thousand people on the relief rolls here in New York and all of these factors are not improving. On the contrary there has been a marked increase of unemployment benefits, more people going on relief, and the housing situation is becoming more critical.

From a common-sense point of view I cannot see the wisdom of bringing more and more of people who will need a place to live, a job, etc., when we cannot take care of those already here. A great many of these displaced persons have quite large families and this only adds substantial sums when these persons are given relief.

If our distinguished representatives in Washington do not know these facts—the same conditions as exist here in New York exist throughout the country—then I think it is high time they made a down-to-earth survey before passing legislation detrimental to the interests of the people who sent them to our Nation's Capital to serve as our representatives.

I should be pleased to know what you think of my views on this very important subject.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) HENRIETTA CRAFT.

PASSAIC, N. J., *February 7, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The Senate Judiciary Committee is doing good work in investigating the workings of the Displaced Persons Commission in giving preference to Communists and admitting them to the United States.

But you should also investigate the workings of the IRO, especially the review board in Geneva, and field offices.

Enclosed is a clipping, which shows rejecting honest people and admitting criminals. I know of these cases, because I am sponsoring the entry of the honest man, Michael Marincak, to the United States. The criminal, General Ferjencik, was admitted under the pretense that no witnesses against were available. The clipping will tell you why.

Regarding Michael Marincak I wrote a letter to the IRO office in Washington dated January 28, addressed to Mr. Stone, revealing how the board of review in Geneva works.

A letter dated January 7, I sent to the IRO office in behalf of Imrich Stolarik, whose entry to United States I am also sponsoring, as I found out that he is an honest man and his family.

It is important for your investigation that you go through the files of the IRO office (1346 Connecticut Avenue) to find out about the IRO in Geneva.

There is the case of ousted Communist high officials of the Benes regime in Czechoslovakia who were kicked out because they tried to be included in the Marshall plan. They all were elected to office with Communist approval, then were kicked out in January 1948 and admitted to the United States. This shows how Czech Communists get in easily because they have some pull at the IRO.

I am glad you took up this investigation and wish you much success.

L. KOZAR.

[From the Falcon of December 21, 1949]

FORGING AHEAD

We received letters of appreciation for our Forging Ahead columns of November 30 and December 7, with the encouragement to keep up the hot stuff.

It makes us feel better when we get recognition for our presentation of facts on current events.

But it is significant that we did not receive any denunciations of our stand against injustice perpetrated by those who are in power. They could easily accuse us of not presenting true facts.

Our friend suggests that we all write to our Congressmen (Senators and Representatives) about the topics presented in the Forging Ahead column pertaining to social improvements and adjustments.

Many individuals among us have a superficial knowledge about our struggles for justice here and abroad. Many of us want to be isolated, to refrain from mixing in troubles of distant countries. They do not realize that our isolation and detachment led us into the second war.

Therefore, everybody who has a deeper knowledge of causation, should spread his knowledge to others.

A letter from a Slovak refugee in Austria discloses that he was excluded from the International Refugee Organization with insufficient explanation for the cause.

Last January he applied again for admission and in October was given a hearing in Linz. To his surprise he was asked about his tobacco factory. He explained that he conducted a little store, and not a factory, where he sold tobacco among other merchandise.

After the hearing he was notified from headquarters in Geneva about his rejection. Some excuse was given in German, something about a signature—whatever that meant. He sent us the original of this rejection and we could not determine the meaning of the excuse, although we know a little German.

He informed us that the witnesses were Germans and Communists.

This is IRO in action—against honest people.

A Communist, General Ferjencik, applied for admission to the IRO and was readily admitted, no pertinent questions asked and was recommended for passage to the United States.

In New York some public-spirited citizens were informed about his past activities, and caused his detention, resulting in a hearing.

The judge wanted testimony of eyewitnesses.

To procure testimony against a Communist general is a hard task, because the eyewitnesses were killed off behind the iron curtain and those who are here would not testify, because the Communists would kill their relatives left behind the iron curtain.

Consequently, the culprit was set free conditionally. If a witness would be willing to testify against him, he would be summoned to another hearing.

This is an example of how easy a Communist may enter the United States when he carefully wipes out all disagreeable testimony.

There is much speculation about the future movements of the Russian anarchists.

The Germans, under Allied control in west Germany, should be armed so they could readily defend their country, if attacked by the Russian anarchists.

The military problem of western Europe is the counteraction against the Soviet Army, which is considered to be stronger than the combined armies of western Europe.

Western Germany, mobilized, would considerably increase the strength of the Allied army and the Russian terrorists would not start war against such big odds.

The French are much afraid of an armed Germany, but they should consider that the Germans would get the necessary ammunitions and armaments from the Allies.

The manufacture of arms and ammunition would be under control of the Allies.

Any weapon is useless without ammunition and if the Germans do not get ammunition for their rifles and cannons, they cannot do any harm.

All this considered, the Germans in west Germany should be armed, so that they may hold the Soviet Army in check and eventually drive them back to their own country—where they belong.

PORTLAND AMERICANIZATION COUNCIL,
Portland, Oreg., January 27, 1950.

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to the attention of this council that House Resolution 4567 is now under consideration in the United States Senate and, after careful study of the effects of this resolution, should it become a law of our land, we feel it would cause a great deal of hardship and lowering of the standard of our American way of life. Therefore, we earnestly seek your active support in defeating this resolution.

Our National Government has already appropriated and spent billions of dollars for rehabilitation and relief under the Marshall plan in order that the countries involved, or so covered, could take care of all groups, including displaced persons, and the time has now arrived when our Congress and National Government must recognize the needs of our own people by rejecting the provisions of House Resolution 4567.

We most respectfully request that you carefully analyze the following reasons for opposing House Resolution 4567:

1. We now find over 15,000 World War II veterans are and have been unemployed in the last 6 months in the State of Oregon.

2. The daily press informs us that the unemployment rate among all types of craftsmen has reached the highest peak since 1939, which is a further indication that House Resolution 4567 would be detrimental to the economy in this Nation.

3. The birth rate of the United States during the past 5 years has reached an all-time

high and, in just a matter of 15 years, these new American-born citizens will be in competition with the immigrants and their families, which will further reduce the standard of living within our country.

4. The relief budget of the State of Oregon and various counties has reached such staggering proportions that it was necessary for the Governor of the State of Oregon to request from the State emergency board an additional $11,000,000 to feed and clothe the needy of our State for the balance of this fiscal year.

5. The educational facilities in the State of Oregon are so overtaxed at the present time that school districts are at a loss to find the money necessary to take care of the present needs, let alone any further population expansion by opening our gates further to immigration.

6. According to the best reports, nationally and particularly in the State of Oregon, the lack of housing for families in the low- and medium-wage brackets is such that further admission of displaced persons would endanger the home life of thousands of Oregon families.

7. Pressure groups are now being organized to insist on preferential employment of displaced persons who are coming within our State, to the detriment of Oregon veterans and laboring people in general. It has already come to the attention of this council that certain city, county, and State officials have employed displaced persons in top positions, while our own college and university graduates go begging for jobs.

The executive board of the Portland Americanization Council, at a meeting held January 26, 1950, directed the undersigned to transmit the action of the council to you.

Very truly yours,

PORTLAND AMERICANIZATION COUNCIL,
By GEORGE E. SANDY.
MRS. D. E. NEWSOM.
GEORGE J. CHURCH.
MABEL SUMMERKAMP.
VIOLA ORTSCHILD.

DULA HOSPITAL,
Lenoir, N. C., February 16, 1950.

SENATOR PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Thank you for sending me reprints on displaced persons.

I agree wholeheartedly with you in your attitude against H. R. 4567 and all its implications. I feel very definitely that we can very easily destroy the whole way of life of America if we do not carefully control immigration.

I am reminded especially of the refugee doctors who came to our shores in flight from oppression and danger and who remained here to firmly establish themselves in more desirable medical practice than they could have had elsewhere, instead of returning to the fight against their oppressors. Once they arrived here it was no longer their battle, it was ours, and they took advantage of the patriotic doctors of this Nation who had gone forth to fight against the same oppressors from which these spineless arrogant beggars had fled.

Keep up your fight and do not let America be the haven for all those who are unwilling to fight the battle over there and yet who would just as willingly precipitate us into just such a battle here.

Yours very truly,

FRED M. DULA, M. D.

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., February 3, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith copy of an article dealing with the displaced-persons bill (H. R. 4567), shortly coming before the Senate, which appears in the February issue of the Steuben News.

Will you be good enough to give the arguments set forth in the article your kind and careful consideration. At the same time I call to your attention once again the testimony given by this society before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the problem of the expellees (displaced persons of German ethnic origin) on August 5.

It is the feeling of the membership of this organization that the benefits accruing to the expellees by virtue of section 12 of the pending bill will be nullified by the provisions of section 13. As the 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 expellees in western Germany may well become in a short time a serious problem to the people of the struggling German Republic, as well as to the American taxpayer via the Marshall plan, it is our considered judgment that a small percentage of farm laborers, skilled artisans, and others among these industrious people should be siphoned off the overflow and admitted to the United States of America under the displaced-persons legislation.

I feel that the arguments against certain phases of section 13 have been set down most carefully, after a thorough study of the entire problem.

May I ask you to judge our suggestions on their merits and to favor any changes and/or amendments during the coming debate on the Senate floor which might provide an equitable solution of the expellee question within the framework of H. R. 4567.

Thanking you for your interest, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THEO. H. HOFFMANN,
National Chairman.

[From the Steuben News for February 1950]

THE SENATE DP BILL AND THE EXPELLEES—THE AMENDED HOUSE BILL WILL COME UP FOR DEBATE IN THE SENATE VERY SOON—SPIRIT OF RETRIBUTION STILL RAMPANT—THE OBNOXIOUS SECTION 13—WHAT ANY GOOD CITIZEN CAN AND MUST DO ABOUT IT—PROMPT ACTION IS NEEDED

A displaced-persons bill differing in several points from that which was passed by the House of Representatives on June 2, 1949, H. R. 4567, introduced by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, in order to "liberalize" the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and will come to the floor of the Senate during the current session of Congress.

Those who follow the workings on Capitol Hill closely will remember that the House-approved bill was "bottled up" in the Senate Judiciary Committee, according to those who wanted rapid action and were unable to get it during the last session of Congress. Quite some pressure was exerted on the Senate, and finally, just before it adjourned last fall and during the absence of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, the committee chairman, in Europe, the upper House ordered the Judiciary Committee to report out a DP bill by January 25, 1950.

Whatever the true merits of the House bill and of the Senate version, there is no doubt whatsoever that the Senate Judiciary Committee has done a conscientious job in the face of many difficulties.

MANY HEARINGS HELD

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, there have been many, many hearings before the Senate committee, and, whatever his personal attitude on DP legislation may be, no fair and unbiased person will entertain doubts as to the diligence and impartiality of the Senator from Nevada. The record, which will be in print very soon, speaks for itself—representatives of many groups and organizations, as well as individuals, were heard by the committee, and their testimony is reflected in the Senate bill.

The chairman was trying scrupulously to hear every side of an extremely difficult argument, and more than once had to submit to violent attacks by witnesses and by newspaper writers who seemed to be unable to take questions of basic attitudes on immigration—and of geography—into consideration.

Before comparing both bills in detail, it their testimony is reflected in the Senate bill. like the House bill, will not please everyone.

In fact, it will please very few.

It is the logical product of compromise and the just as logical result is that practically everybody will find fault with it. Some people, after careful study, have even gone so far as to call it a typical case of political log rolling.

TRYING TO PLEASE ALL

With so much testimony on hand and subject to the natural desire to please all those who have taken a special interest in displaced-persons legislation—pro and contra—it is well possible that the Senate Judiciary Committee, in the principal issues of the proposed legislation, may not have satisfied any one.

Certain changes made in one section of the rather long-winded bill, have been weakened or practically nullified in another section which fact caused an observer on the scene to remark pointedly: "The committee giveth and the committee taketh away."

This case of Senatorial log rolling, to a large extent, must be attributed to the fact that the displaced-persons legislation became a political football, last fall, during the election campaign. It stands to reason that the deliberations of the Senate on the bill, during the coming weeks, and the joint committee sessions after passage in the upper House, will be held in the shadow of the extremely important 1950 congressional elections—a fact which will make clear-cut decisions on the true merits of this legislation more than illusory.

THERE WAS NO DISCRIMINATION

It is highly regrettable that even the President of the United States attacked the legislation of 1948 as discriminatory on religious grounds, notwithstanding the well-proven fact that Jewish as well as Catholic displaced persons predominated among those admitted here under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 through November 1949. Only recently (January 10, 1950), a spokesman for the National Catholic Resettlement Council stated categorically that present legislation was not anti-Catholic, as has been charged by President Truman and others who had called the restrictive features of the Displaced Persons Act and anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic.

The official figures of the State Department (up to and including November 1949) are as follows: Jewish, 33,479 (26 percent); Roman Catholic, 53,402 (41 percent); Protestant, 20,279 (16 percent); Greek Orthodox, 19,283 (15 percent); others and unknown, 1,423 (2 percent).

The Senate Judiciary Committee further stated that under the President's directive admitting displaced persons prior to the enactment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, 12 percent of the visas issued were to persons of non-Catholic and non-Jewish faith, while 88 percent of the visas issued were to persons of Catholic or Jewish faith.

Any fair-minded person will agree with the committee's opinion that these statistics flatly refute the charges which have frequently been made to the effect that the present law discriminates against the persons of Jewish or Catholic faith.

Unfortunately, the bland assurance with which these persons in high places make their ill-founded statements for the sake of political expediency have already done immeasurable harm and will continue to make their weight felt during the coming deliberations in the Senate.

WHERE THE BILLS AGREE

These are the points in which the House bill and the proposed Senate bill generally agree:

Both extend the cut-off date—the date before which refugees must have arrived in the western zones of Germany and Austria, to be considered eligible DP's. Under the old date, December 22, 1945, many persons fleeing political or religious persecution in eastern Europe during 1946 and 1947, were excluded. Under the new date—January 1, 1949—they may be admitted to the United States.

AND WHERE THEY DIFFER

These are the points in which the House bill and the proposed Senate bill differ:

The House bill repeals a provision of the 1948 act which required that 40 percent of admitted DP's come from "areas which have been de facto annexed by a foreign power" (Baltic nations). The Senate version retains this provision.

The House bill kills a provision that 30 percent of admitted DP's be farm workers. The Senate version retains the provision and strengthens it by requiring 2 years of farm experience.

The House bill, as originally presented, had changed the International Refugee Organization's (IRO) definition of "displaced persons" by making provisions for the expellees (Volksdeutsche driven from eastern Europe into rump Germany by the decisions of Yalta and Potsdam, endorsed by the late President Roosevelt and by President Truman). It had, however, preserved the authority of the IRO within the framework of the bill.

The Senate bill goes further. It not only stipulates that half of the German and Austrian immigration quotas, until July 1, 1952, "be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia," but it adds, "and areas under the control and domination of any such countries," and it furthermore stipulates that "the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to immediately resume general consular activities in Germany and Austria to the end that the German and Austrian quotas shall be available for immigration visas pursuant to the immigration laws" and that "it shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation of the problems of persons of German ethnic origin who were expelled from the country of their residence into Germany and Austria and are presently residing in those countries." Finally the Senate version proposes a complete divorce from the activities of the IRO.

Taken as a whole, the Senate bill would admit roughly 320,000 DP's as compared to the 339,000 provided for in the House bill. About 125,000 have already been admitted under the 1948 act.

These are the bare facts of the Senate provisions and of the bill passed by the House last June.

CASE OF THE DP'S

We have the fullest measure of compassion for those unfortunate people from the east who became Hitler's slave laborers during the war years. We want them to be treated justly and in accordance with the traditional humaneness of this great Nation. We also feel strongly for those Poles, Greeks, and Czechoslovaks for whom the Senate bill makes special provisions.

However, we feel just as strongly for the ten to twelve million of expellees—those Volksdeutsche who had prospered and cultivated the soil for hundreds of years in eastern and southeastern Europe, and who were driven from their homes, with often less than the bare essentials on their backs, into a devastated Germany by the unilateral action of the victors, as pronounced at Yalta and at Potsdam—in one of the most brutal and most stupid deeds ever committed by fellow human beings.

It is with extreme bitterness that we state the seemingly unalterable fact that human kindness as well as a minimum of self-enlightened self-interest are still subjected to hatred and a burning desire for retribution—5 years after the end of the war. The acrimonious remarks of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, the constant drumfire of powerful pressure groups in Washington, and the mockery of the influential New York Times are united to kill all those provisions which might enable a very small proportion of those millions of unfortunate and depressed expellees—so highly skilled in farm labor, artisanship, forestry, and many related professions—to enter this country under the Senate DP bill.

THE FIGHT IN THE SENATE

During the coming debate these forces have to be counteracted. Section 12 of the pending Senate bill favors the admission of DP's of German ethnic origin under the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, up to and including the deadline set for July 1, 1952. If this section stood by itself and, by the action of both Houses, would be made into law, just an infinitesimal percentage of the ten to twelve million expellees might find a new home in this country and serve their new nation, to the best of their rich abilities.

But, in accordance with the age-old law to please everybody, section 12 of the bill is followed by section 13, which might well make it impossible to admit a single one of these persecuted people into the United States.

KILL SECTION 13

Section 13 states, first of all, that no person who is or has been a member of the Communist Party or (amended) a Marxist, may enter the United States.

I agree fully and completely with the ban on the adherents of the Communist doctrine. But, I want to ask the distinguished Senator who introduced the amendment, "or Marxist," whether he has studied this question carefully. I, personally, have an entirely different outlook on political-economic affairs than that promulgated by those whom I want to call the classical Marxist theorist."

I am, however, reasonably sure that a German Social Democrat steeped in the theories of Marx and Bebel—or a Socialist of any other European nation—could contribute mightily to the cause of unionism and fair play between employer and employee in this country. Section 13, automatically, would exclude him—be he even a valiant fighter against Nazism who had to suffer the horrors of the concentration camps.

This sentence, which may have grown out of the fear complex of certain people, will have to be changed in order to avoid discrimination and to leave the field wide open for any subaltern employee in any American consulate in Europe to interpret the law in accordance with his own whims and prejudices.

The same holds true—and much more so—for that paragraph in section 13 of the Senate bill which provides that any one shall be excluded who has borne arms against the United States or who has been a member of * * * any movement hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

IT MIGHT BE INTERPRETED

This, again, may well be interpreted by a consular underling to halt all and any immigration from Germany and Austria into the United States completely. There is good cause to believe that certain groups in this country are in favor of these paragraphs, as the most effective stop to the influx of immigrants of German ethnic origin under the new law.

In all fairness, I wish to state that "major offenders" and all those who have been found guilty by allied and German courts to be Nazis, should be excluded from entry into the United States.

But a rigid interpretation of the wording would make it impossible for all those who, at the outbreak of World War II, were called for service in the German Army or Navy, etc., or who, being civil-service employees, artisans, workers, etc., were forced to become members of one of the innumerable Nazi labor organizations, to ever enter the portals of the United States—practically the entire population of the German Nation at war.

I am firmly convinced that this is not the purpose of the Senate bill. Most of the Germans "who ran with the mob," but did not participate actively, have been cleared by allied courts and fully restored to citizenship.

They were frail human beings subject to pressure like anyone else and should not be subjected to an undeserved hardship which, if interpreted verbally, would eliminate German immigration entirely. If it had been the purpose to kill German immigration, section 12 in itself would constitute nothing but an empty gesture, with no solid foundation behind it. Or, do the apostles of perpetual hatred enjoy such ar influence in the Senate Judiciary Committee that this "joker" was slipped in for a very definite purpose?

It is hard to believe. If, however, such is the case, I have ill forebodings for the future harmony and tolerance among the many groups and nationalities of this country.

I also do not agree with the assertion of the United States High Commisisoner in Germany, John J. McCloy, and with the attitude of certain spokesmen in our own State Department that the "expellee" problem is a problem to be solved by the Bonn government, exclusively.

It is a problem to the solution of which the Government of the United States must contribute to a large extent and to the best of its knowledge.

It is a problem primarily of our making; moreover, a problem which this nation will have to tackle under international law and the stipulations of the Hague Conventions which govern the duties of an occupying power.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES RISE

There are close to two million unemployed in the Bonn Republic and there are no signs of an improvement in the labor market. To siphon off at least a small percentage of the highly skilled expellees would undoubtedly help the infant German Republic and—the American taxpayer. Moreover, this, our Nation would benefit from the ingenuity, the industry, and the will to succeed of the German immigrant who has contributed so mightily to the growth of this land and of the United States for the past 275 years.

The debate on the DP bill in the Senate will be bitter and prolonged. Mighty and ruthless adversaries will be at work to eliminate German immigration, altogether.

But the record as laid down by religious, civic, labor, and patriotic organizations in the hearing files of the Committee on the Judiciary of the upper House, will speak for itself.

It is the bounden duty of any one, with expellee relations in Germany or with the desire to see harmony restored to the western family of nations, to write, immediately and without reserve, to his Senators and to urge them to strike out section 13 of the amended bill H. R. 4567 completely or to amend it in such a way that the benefits of section 12 of the bill to the displaced persons of German ethnic origin (expellees) will not be completely nullified by the utterly vicious and obnoxious section 13 of that bill.

The Members of the Senate will listen to the voice of the people. But it is vitally necessary that that voice be heard—promptly and decisively.

J. H. MEYER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 23, 1950.*

Miss ADAMS,

Executive Secretary, Senator Pat McCarran, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS ADAMS: When I wrote Senator MCCARRAN about the DP bill last summer, I noticed you had signed the reply since the Senator was in Europe. I thought you might like to have this clipping from the Chicago Tribune of this date to put in your files, since it represents the opinion of men who are in the employment field and in a position to know the conditions.

Yours very truly,

BUREN BOUNELL.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 26, 1950]

UNITED STATES ALLOWING DP'S TO SPONSOR OTHER REFUGEES—CITIZENSHIP NOT A TEST, STATE DISCLOSES

Displaced persons who have streamed into the United States from Europe during the last 16 months under the 1948 DP Act are being allowed by Federal authorities to act as sponsors for other refugees seeking admittance to this country, an official of the Illinois Displaced Persons Commission disclosed yesterday.

Such sponsors—homeless and largely destitute themselves until they arrived from Europe—are finding it possible to sign vouchers for new refugees before the sponsors themselves even have applied for first citizenship papers, it was explained.

CITIZENSHIP NOT REQUIRED

"There is nothing in the DP Act which specifies that the sponsor of a displaced person in Europe must be either an American citizen or the holder of first citizenship papers," the Illinois commission official said.

"A resident displaced person can sponsor another refugee if he can guarantee the new refugee will be provided with a job and housing without displacing an American citizen and can also guarantee that the new refugee will not become a public charge," the official explained.

Eight or ten cases, in which displaced persons settled in Illinois have filed sponsorship papers for refugees still in Europe, are pending before the Illinois commission, it was said. More are expected in the future.

ONLY TWO ON COUNTY STAFF

It is the commission's duty, in such cases of individual sponsorship of refugees, to determine whether the sponsor is financially able to stand back of the guaranties he gives for the new refugee. Apparently, however, the commission makes no attempt to investigate such sponsors thoroughly.

"We have a staff of only two persons in Cook County," it was explained. "Therefore we generally have to take the word of the sponsor that he is financially able to sponsor a new displaced person."

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 23, 1950]

CHANCES OF JOB FOR OLDER MEN GROW DIMMER—MANY CLOSED TO THEM IN VARIOUS FIELDS

What to do about the elderly but still capable job hunter is becoming a No. 1 problem of society, employment counselors here agreed yesterday.

They referred to the man who has passed about 46 or 48 years of age and who, for this reason alone, finds many jobs closed to him; the man who may have had many years of experience in responsible positions and is still mentally alert and healthy, although he may be physically incapacitated for certain types of work; the men who may be ineligible for social-security benefits for one reason or another but is too proud to ask for charity.

Agencies here estimated that 1 out of every 20 applicants today are in that category. Robert Bell, an official of one agency, said that the number was increasing rapidly "but we still find the doors of employers locked and sealed in our efforts to help them."

FEW SOLUTIONS SUGGESTED

There are many explanations for the trend, but few solutions suggested.

Bell suggested as a solution that charitable agencies devoted to the aged might be willing to help elderly people find jobs if they knew the need. For each man they helped get a job, there would be one fewer potential inmate of old folks' homes or one fewer habitue of skid row.

Others, typified by Charles Leland, president of a counseling service specializing in executive positions, felt the solution was to convince management that age need not be a draw-back.

"The reluctance of industry to use the ability of these men," said Leland, "is becoming a serious problem. Too often their first—and sometimes their only—question of an applicant is 'How old are you?' Many of them tell us they won't take anyone over 50."

WANT EXPERIENCE IN YOUNG

"A great weakness of top management is that they are looking for a man with 50 years' experience at the age of 35. They like to feel that they can count on a man's usefulness for 30 years or so, even though past experience has shown that the average tenure of a key man is no more than 6 years."

The experience of various agencies shows that it is easier for an elderly laborer to get a job as a laborer than for an elderly teacher or executive with valuable experience to get a job even as a clerk.

Another obstacle is the high pension cost incurred by hiring older men.

The increasing number of elderly job hunters was generally attributed to the Nation's increasing life expectancy, which increases the ranks of the aged.

Bell, in addition, placed some of the blame on immigration under the displaced persons law.

"Too much latitude in administering the law," he said, "has permitted DP's to move away from the jobs for which they were admitted and into others for which we already have a surplus of applicants, thus creating another job barrier."

[From the Washington Post of February 23, 1950]

DP DANGER

It has become smart and fashionable for cartoonists to lampoon American citizens who are opposed to the admission of displaced parasites as illiberal and bigoted, and for editors to denounce them as un-American. The fact is that these Americans are putting the interests of the U. S. A. first, whereas the advocates of relaxed immigration laws are putting first the interest of the DP's.

In one recent issue of a metropolitan daily there were: an editorial advocating admission of more DP's, a story of the water shortage in New York (and impending shortages in other regions, including Maryland), and a story of increasing unemployment in this country. These three items are closely related, and all points to the inability of this country in coming centuries to support its population. More recently, Washington papers carried the story of the failure of the DP program in Maryland, because of the unwillingness of the DP's to remain on the farms.

The issue is simple. Our population, with further immigration, is increasing rapidly; our resources are being exhausted rapidly. Water is only one example but perhaps the most important. Our national unity is being further diluted by the admission of racial and religious groups who have no loyalty to the United States. The claim that Communists and undesirables are being screened out is patently absurd. If we cannot keep Communists and spies out of the State and Justice Departments, how can we screen them out of a mob which will swear to anything to gain the haven of the United States? Because Senator MCCARRAN is defending the interests of the United States against the interests of foreigners, he is being abused by the racial and religious pressure groups as if he were a traitor as virulent as Benedict Arnold.

F. S. WILSON.

CHEVY CHASE.

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. STENNIS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Mississippi wishes to point out very briefly that the cotton section of the joint resolution now pending before the Senate is, after all, a very conservative measure in the number of acres which will be involved in its administration, or the number of acres which will be added to the total number of acres which can be planted. It is estimated that from 600,000 to 700,000 acres will be sufficient to take care of the provisions of the joint resolution. It is not a grab measure. It is not an attempt on our part to get all the extra acres we can. Rather, it is a request for acres which are absolutely necessary in order to eradicate and eliminate, not all but some of the inequities which have arisen with reference to the application of the bill passed in 1949, the cotton acreage control bill, which, as a whole, in my opinion, is a very fine bill. It can be improved from year to year by legislation, as all such matters can be, and the pending measure is one of the steps which I submit are necessary. It arises solely through the application of the 1949 act.

I should further like to point out that fair estimates, made by those in a position to know, are to the effect that even after the joint resolution becomes a law and the acreage is allowed, the total amount of acres planted for the 1950 crop will not equal the 21,000,000 acres allowed by the 1949 law.

In other words, Mr. President, it is fairly clear that there will be perhaps a million, a million and a half, or possibly 2,000,000 acres under the 21,000,000-acre allotment which will not actually be planted. The allotment has been made, but the seed will not be placed in the ground. So, even if we can add in the additional acres referred to, we shall still be within the limits of the 21,000,000 acres established in the 1949 act. There does not seem to be any contest about the facts with reference to that point.

Mr. President, there is one statement which has been made on the floor of the Senate, and that is, that this resolution is mainly to take care of the larger projects. I think it should be pointed out again, and, to borrow a phrase, it should be "underscored," that this resolution is not simply for the purpose of remedying the situation with reference to the large mechanized farms or the larger projects,

as that term is ordinarily understood. It is true that the 1949 law pretty well takes care of the small producer who owns his land. When I say "small producer" I mean the man who plants 5, 10, or 15 acres of cotton. He is a land owner, and the application has worked out fairly and he is taken care of. But the small man who has been injured by these inequitable applications, in some counties, is the tenant farmer. He is a tenant on a farm of 50, 60, 75, 100, or more acres. He does not have control over the land. He does not receive a direct allotment under the terms of the law, whereas his neighbor, who owns the land on which he lives, receives an independent allotment and he has been taken care of.

The actual operation is that the landowner who has 40, 50, 60, 75, 100, or more acres of cotton, who has been hit particularly hard in the reductions, will receive some extra acres, but that acreage will really accrue, in a large number of instances, to the small tenant farmer. He is the man who does not know whether he will be able to remain on the land. He does not know what the situation will be this year. There are no acres available to apply to such farms in some of the counties, and the only way to reach his problem this year is to pass a measure along the lines of this resolution. Therefore, to say this resolution takes care of the larger projects, and stop there, is to leave a misleading impression. A great part of the acreage under this resolution will actually be used in filtering down to the tenant farmers who would otherwise be left high and dry. It varies from county to county. From correspondence and information in the area in which I live and from other areas in the Cotton Belt, I am sure my facts are correct. I am further sure that the application of the resolution will meet the situation as to some of the tenants, not all, because some of them are going to have to move; but, after all, it is a cotton-acreage-reduction program and everyone engaged in cotton growing cannot be taken care of.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi this question: Whether a man be a small or a large cotton grower, and has not been cut as much as 40 percent down to 60 percent over the average years 1946, 1947, and 1948, this resolution would not affect him at all? Is not that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If he had tillable land, he could not plant more than 40 percent of it in cotton. Is not that a fact?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct.

This resolution, it is true, without any named number of acres as a limitation, opens up the power to allocate new and additional acreage, without naming any number of additional acres which can be allocated. But there are two very effective safeguards, as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out. There are two very effective safeguards which will keep any board, be it in Washington, on the State level, or on the local level, from running away with the bridle and bit, so to speak, in connection with the application of new acres. No owner, large, small, in between, or any other, under this resolution, can receive an allotment of acreage which exceeds 60 percent of his average acreage for cotton for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. I am omitting last year.

Another limitation and safeguard is that in no event can an operator, middle-sized or large, receive more than 40 percent of his tillable acres. That means the total of all crops. So, with those limitations written into the resolution, and with scientific information at hand upon which they are based, we can assure the Congress, I think, that there is no way for it to result in a runaway proposition, with the piling up of acreage just for the sake of trying to make money out of it. Most of the acreage allowed under the resolution would be used in an effort to make a living and to get the necessities of life. A great part of the acreage will apply to the family-unit-size farms and will be for the benefit of the farmer.

There is one further matter, Mr. President, which I wish to mention. I should like to remind the Senate that it is already cotton-planting time, and beyond, in a great portion of the cotton-growing areas. It will take time to consider the resolution in conference. It will take time for the President to make a study of it. It will take time for it to become law, and it will take time for the Department of Agriculture to set it in motion. It must work down to State level and then to the county level. Thousands of persons will be involved in the operation of it. All of these matters take time.

In addition to that, the land has to be prepared for planting. Fertilizer has to be obtained. This measure is long past due. It is a great pity it was not possible to reach the resolution earlier, but there were obstacles in the way.

I want to thank the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for its consideration of the matter. But time is running out. We are burning daylight. I hope Congress will see fit to adopt the resolution immediately, because time is of the essence.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In order to get clearly into the RECORD an interpretation of the resolution, I want to read one sentence and then to explain it briefly:

> 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.

Is it the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi that that language means they do not have to rely absolutely upon the BAE figures?

Mr. STENNIS. That is my understanding. It is put more or less on the basis of such evidence as may be brought to the committee from any source, and then the State committee has the final say.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is also my impression.

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to hear the observation of the distinguished Senator relative to the evidence which should be used for the purpose of establishing a county quota. I have in mind one particular county in Tennessee, Lincoln County, where there has been more complaint about the operation of the act than there has been in any other county.

The BAE figure is considerably below what the committee ascertained to be the actual figure after getting the result of ginnings in the various gins which processed the cotton from that county. It would seem that in fairness to the cotton growers of that county, where they do present definite, substantiated evidence, which is not just guesswork, but where they have gotten actual figures, the county committee and the State committee should consider and take those calculations, rather than the BAE figures, which we all admit are more or less guesswork and are not held out as being absolutely accurate. Does not the Senator agree that that should be done?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Tennessee is correct, except that, of course, it is a wise provision to have this added clause, "and shall be subject to review by the State committee." With that there is plugged up a loophole, so that if any county should become arbitrary, or should run away with the acreage, so to speak, then the State committee, which is keeping an eye on the operation of these matters throughout all counties, could have those matters brought up before the State committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I admit that that is a wise provision.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the procedure set up in the bill is very sound and workable.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator does agree with the Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from Tennessee that evidence other than that of the BAE should be taken into consideration, and if it is more accurate, should be adopted rather than the BAE calculations?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely. I think that is entirely correct, but I think the BAE evidence is worthy of consideration. In some areas I understand they do splendid work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield the floor.

RESULTS OF AMERICAN FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE ENGLISH ELECTIONS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, American dollars bought the election yesterday in England. Without the constant rolling of American dollars into the empty tills of the British Socialist Government it would have collapsed long ago from its own wasteful extravagance.

The English election results confirmed what many of us have long suspected: the hand-out state at the expense of somebody else is unbeatable. Our British friends decided not to turn their backs on their American Santa Claus.

Since the British Socialist Government came into power in 1945 it has squandered its way through more than $6,500,000,000 in American gifts. The Honorable Clement Attlee, Sir Stafford Cripps, and their associates have used our dollars to finance experiments in socialism, one after another. American dollars made possible the Socialist subsidies on food, enabling British housewives to buy groceries for as little as one-fourth the price our housewives pay here at home for the same items. American dollars made possible the British program of socialized medicine—replete with free wigs and false teeth for all.

American dollars—Marshall-plan dollars—made possible the Socialist acquisition or nationalization of 10 of Britain's most important industries. To have done this without American aid would have bankrupted the British Government. More than $500,000,000 worth of Marshall-plan counterpart funds have been used to reduce the British national debt, swollen by the purchase, with Government bonds, of nationalized industries.

American dollars made it possible for these nationalized industries to absorb staggering losses, which would otherwise have disrupted the British economy. The Government-owned transport system, for example, is running into the red at the rate of $1,500,000 every week. At least part of the losses of the socialized industries was covered by short-term borrowing. This, of course, also increased the British national debt, which we have taken under our wing, and which we are permitting to be reduced by Marshall-plan counterpart funds.

American dollars have spared the British people from the inevitable hardships which would have otherwise resulted from their Government's attempt to put into practical operation the theories of Karl Marx.

Socialist leaders in Britain have used our dollars to drug a majority of the British people into a state of happy acquiescence in the creeping destruction of their liberties.

In short, as I have said before in the Senate, American dollars have been used as a great political slush fund to keep the Socialists in power. As Winston Churchill recently said:

> Fancy the Socialist Government in England keeping itself alive economically and politically by these large annual dollops of dollars from capitalist America.

And is that Socialist Government grateful for the assistance we have given them? Again I quote Mr. Churchill:

> They—
>
> The Socialists—
>
> seek the dollars, they beg the dollars, they bluster for the dollars, they gobble the dollars, but in the whole of their 8,000-word manifesto they cannot say "thank you" for the dollars.

Mr. President, the Socialists in Britain spared no effort to insure that victory would be theirs. In 1949 the Government enacted a new election law severely limiting the activities of British candidates. Under the new law, a candidate's expenses during the campaign are limited to £450 sterling—about $1,260—plus a small stipend for each voter in his district. It is true that these limitations apply to Conservative and Socialist candidates alike. But why should the Socialists worry about limitations on their candidates' campaign expenses when the American dole was ready at hand? Since July 1, 1949, ECA made available more than $730,000,000 to the British Socialist Government. Mr. President, let us understand that clearly. That money was made available, not to the British people directly, but to the British Socialist Government. During the past 7 weeks, a total of more than $120,000,000 was granted. I repeat, during the past 7 weeks, a total of more than $120,000,000 was granted. Shall we call this a last-minute campaign kitty? Is it any wonder, then, that the tide ran red in England when so many dollars were available for the Socialists to use, and which were used in so many ways to sweeten the otherwise unpalatable doses of their socialistic experiments?

The Socialists did not see fit to express a word of thanks for American aid in their party manifesto. They did not hesitate to bribe and to lull the British electorate with promises of still more sweetness and light in the form of gifts from America. Sir Stafford Cripps, on January 9, 1950, pointedly remarked that he hoped a second round of dollar talks with the administration—that is, the Truman administration—would not be long delayed. Foreign Secretary Bevin, only 4 days before the election, told a political audience in Croydon that his Socialist regime is discussing steps with the United States to get economic assistance when the Marshall plan ends in 1952. Mr. Bevin said at that time:

> We are already discussing with the United States the situation which may arise (when the Marshall plan ends) * * *. We are working hard to see whether we can bring about a new payment scheme in exchange.

Apparently the British electors were persuaded that a Socialist government would get the maximum cooperation from the present administration in the United States.

Last year, when Mr. Hoffman appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in his annual quest for additional funds, he expressed himself as convinced that the Marshall plan was the way to check the advance of socialism in Great Britain. He seemed to think that the Marshall plan would make the British so happy and contented that they would turn back from socialism. Well, the results of the British election should serve to rid Mr. Hoffman of that one delusion, at any rate.

Now, as a matter of course, the Socialist government will carry out its plans to liquidate what remains of the British free-enterprise system. The all-important iron and steel industry will be nationalized on January 1, 1951, pursuant to a law enacted last year. The Socialists have announced that they will also seize the sugar industry, the cement industry, water works, wholesale meat, fruit, and vegetable markets, slaughterhouses, and all suitable mineral deposits. And unless the Congress decides otherwise, this socialization program will be financed by Marshall plan dollars. On Tuesday, last, Mr. Hoffman proposed that Congress authorize the expenditure of about $3,000,000,000 for the third year of the Marshall plan. Of this sum, the British Socialist Government, as usual, would receive the lion's share, or more than $687,000,000.

Mr. President, last year I submitted an amendment to the Marshall plan which would have prevented the allocation of dollars to any Marshall plan country nationalizing additional basic industries. As I saw it, there was a pressing need for such an amendment. A majority of the Senate thought otherwise at that time. But, in my opinion, yesterday's development in Britain has thrown an entirely new light on the situation. I shall again submit this amendment when the Marshall plan authorization bill is brought to the floor of the Senate this session.

The American people are tired of wet-nursing the Socialist regime in Britain. They want to halt the flow of free-enterprise American dollars for British socialism. They oppose any more dollar doles for Socialist doodling and dawdling.

DISPLACED PERSONS LEGISLATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from a bipartisan group of 10 eminent and distinguished Americans, including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Gen. Lucius Clay, Gen. William J. Donovan, and Mr. Fred Lazarus, on the subject of displaced persons and the displaced-persons legislation now pending before the Senate. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert the text of this telegram, which is very brief, in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1950.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As Americans we are deeply concerned that our country fulfill our moral obligation and international commitment to find new democratic homelands for the helpless displaced human beings under our care in Europe. Therefore we respectfully petition the Members of the United States Senate to approve the substitute amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 presented by Senators FERGUSON, GRAHAM, and KILGORE. It is our sincere and heartfelt conviction that without these amendments it is impossible for us to create a displaced-persons law that will enable our Nation to admit our share of displaced persons in a just, humane, and fair way.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, James A. Farley, Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, James F. O'Neil, Judge Joseph Proskauer, James L. Kraft, Mark Ethridge, Fred Lazarus, Harry Bullis.

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. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Holland	Neely
Benton	Hunt	Robertson
Bricker	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Leahy	Sparkman
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Darby	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Tydings
Green	Maybank	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Williams
Hill	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Mississippi objects, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the calling of the roll be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been disclosed, and the Senate cannot give such unanimous consent at this time.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. WITHERS entered the Chamber and answered to their names, when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the majority and minority leaders have put Senators on notice that, if we do not complete action upon the joint resolution during daylight hours today, we are to be held in session tonight. There are about 10 amendments to be voted on. Under the circumstances, since the matter has been pending some time and since most of the Members of the Senate have, I assume, reached their conclusion as to what they are going to do, I hope we may have the cooperation of everyone to the end that we may finish the bill without a night session.

Mr. BREWSTER. I share the Senator's view.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly in opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the so-called Lucas amendment, which appears as section 2 in the printed joint resolution. I think it may be well to recite briefly the history of the so-called Lucas amendment, so that Senators may understand the action of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and what, insofar as is known to me, was the intention of the committee in taking the action it did. Two meetings were held upon this particular measure, before it was reported; or, let us say, the two last meetings held upon it were the meetings at which the measure was discussed. In the first instance the Senator from Illinois, in conjunction with the junior Senator from Florida and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], proposed at the first of the last two meetings the amendment which is now referred to as the Aiken amendment, which, if adopted, would replace the so-called Lucas amendment. For the purpose of the RECORD I read it, as follows:

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 of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

At the adjournment of the first of the two meetings which I mentioned, it had been tentatively agreed in committee that the amendment should take that form. The committee requested the staff to draft the amendment in such form as to state clearly the intentions of the committee. The second of the two meetings, which was the last meeting held by the committee, took place the next day following the day I have just mentioned. On that day the exact text of the Aiken amendment, as it was then called, was produced for consideration by the committee. The Senator from Illinois in the meantime had decided he felt it would be advisable to eliminate that part of the proposed amendment which had to do with marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. So the committee voted upon two measures. The first proposal was whether the reference to marketing agreements or marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 should be omitted from the proposed or discussed amendment. Upon the vote on that proposal, the provision relative to marketing orders was omitted. The Senator from Illinois then offered his amendment, which was attached to the bill, and now appears as section 2 of the printed bill. For the RECORD, I read it, as follows:

SEC. 2. 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.

In other words, the action as taken by the committee, which finally passed upon the Lucas amendment, omits any reference to marketing orders, and instead attaches the Lucas amendment in the form in which it now appears as section 2 of the printed joint resolution.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is the discussion, which was a lengthy one, was on the method or manner of passing upon this matter in such a way as to assure as quickly as possible affirmative action by the Congress which would do away with the possibility of gross abuse, which had been sustained not only by the potato support-price program but by the agricultural price-support program in general, as a result of excessive production of potatoes. I think all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who are present will agree that that was the objective of the committee, and a majority of the committee finally decided that that result would best be produced by the adoption of the Lucas amendment, now appearing as section 2 of the printed joint resolution.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate, however, to the fact that when the amendment was adopted, and at all times in the discussion of the committee prior thereto, it was agreed that what we were trying to do was to insist upon action being taken within a minimum possible time, but not to bring about any condition under which summarily and overnight producers who had relied upon the representation of the United States Government made through the Secretary of Agriculture, that a price-support program would be effective as to their crops this year, provided they reduced their acreage in the figures stated by the Secretary of Agriculture would be cut off. There was no thought of depriving of price support producers who had proceeded in complete good faith upon the strength of the representations and offer made by the Secretary of Agriculture in his release of November 1949. So I call particular attention to the fact that, as adopted by the committee, the Lucas amendment states that—

No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes—

And I call the attention of the Senate particularly to the words which follow—

planted after the enactment of this joint resolution.

It is to the words "planted after the enactment of this joint resolution" to which I want to address myself briefly.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the Senator from Florida tell us what methods the Department of Agriculture plans to use to determine whether a farmer in Virginia, say, has or has not planted his potatoes directly after the enactment of the joint resolution? In other words,

how would the Department plan to enforce the joint resolution if it is passed without the amendment I have offered?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am unable to tell the Senator what would happen, but I may tell the Senator that I know from experience in programs of this kind that it is not a highly burdensome matter to have agents of the Department visit each field. For instance, in the tobacco industry, in which there are many more fields and the plantings are much smaller, we had one year a requirement that leaves of a certain kind be not taken from the stock but be left on the stock, which required a check on the ground of every planting. Many of the plantings, as the Senator knows, are under 1 acre, and there was no difficulty at all in making the check. I think there would be no practical difficulty in the making of the check which the Secretary would be required to make under the joint resolution, and which I think he would make without difficulty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Florida that there is no comparison between the two situations, the situation he has explained and that of the potato farmer. As I see it, there is no way on earth by which, 3 or 4 months from now, the Secretary of Agriculture can determine whether John Jones or Joe Smith planted his potatoes in Virginia, let us say, after the enactment of the joint resolution, or whether he did it this morning. The only possible way it could be done would be to have a sufficient number of agents to go into the States which are planting potatoes overnight, and be there the following morning to see what is being done. It cannot be enforced.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator wants information about the practical matter in connection with the administration of the act, and I would simply say I know it would not be difficult, in the present situation, with PMA and other agricultural agencies which are available and which have a very large number of employees, as the Senator knows, to make a spot check at any time, within a very few hours.

To proceed with the matter, it is certainly completely clear that the amendment as suggested affords a period of time which the committee at least thought would be adequate to enable the Congress to enact legislation which will bring firmer terms into the potato price-support program.

Whether this is in a form which the Senate would approve is still another question. The Senate might wish to follow the suggestion made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], to fix a definite cut-off date in the future. The Senate may prefer to follow some other suggestion. But the point I am making is that it was never for a moment considered that the committee was recommending anything which would result overnight in the enactment of a law which would cut off the support prices and the benefit of them to persons who had planted their potato acreage under the terms of an express proposal made by the Secretary of Agriculture, who was named by Congress as the agent of the Government to represent it in the matter, particularly when that proposal involved, as it did, the reduction of acreage—when a grower had accepted that proposal and had reduced his acreage, planted it, fertilized it, cultivated it, and was actually harvesting it at the time of the passage of the joint resolution. It was never for a moment contemplated that such action would be considered fair practice or moral practice, and it certainly was not within the purview of the committee's action to cut off the price-support program in that particular way.

Mr. President, so far as the potato growers of Florida are concerned, they have very little interest in the price-support program. When the time comes, and I hope it will come soon, when we may have a vote on the complete discontinuance of the potato price-support program under terms that are fair and reasonable, it will be found that the Irish potato industry in Florida has affirmatively taken the position that it does not care to have continued any longer the price-support program. In order that the record may be entirely clear on that point, I shall ask the Senate to indulge me for a moment while I read a letter from the Florida Potato Council, dated February 20, 1950, and addressed to me. I read as follows:

FLORIDA POTATO COUNCIL,
Orlando, Fla., February 20, 1950.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: The Florida Potato Council is an affiliate of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, and its directorate is composed of members representing the producers of more than 80 percent of the white potatoes produced in the State of Florida. On February 12 the board voted unanimously to authorize its chairman to advise the National Potato Council and the Members of the Congress that the council was in favor of the elimination of potatoes from the price-support program.

This action was later considered by the Dade County Potato Growers Association, the North Florida Potato Growers Association, the Lee County Potato Growers Association, and a majority of the potato producers in the Lake Okeechobee area (where more than 90 percent of Florida potatoes are produced), and in each instance the action of the board of directors was approved unanimously.

The letter means 90 percent of our production in the four areas mentioned.

Objection to the price-support program is based on a number of factors, including (1) its fundamental unsoundness for perishable commodities; (2) the abuses that have arisen and which could not be avoided; (3) a conviction that the potato industry should solve its own problems rather than lean on Government; and (4) a sincere belief that the adoption of marketing quotas would result in the potato grower losing his independence and in his becoming a vassal of Government, entirely dependent on the whims of a Federal agency which has shown no aptitude for making such programs work.

We trust you will use your good offices as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to help potato growers to free themselves from price supports and the evils that accrue therefrom.

Sincerely yours,

LA MONTE GRAW,
Secretary-Manager.

I have read that letter in detail into the RECORD, Mr. President, because I want to make it clear that at least the growers of one potato industry in the Nation which produced more than 5,000,000 bushels last year are not in accord with the price-support program, which, in their opinion, is not a reasonable program. They have stated their reasons in their communication to me. I glory in the spunk and independence of that particular group of potato growers, and I am happy to report to the Senate of the United States their position on this matter.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator aware that up to February 22 of this year 25,000 bushels of the present Florida crop had been bought by the Government at a price of $1.41 a bushel

Mr. HOLLAND. I was coming to that. If the Senator will let me develop my remarks and then ask me any questions he cares to ask, I should appreciate it, because I want to go into the matter of the amount of help which the Florida potato farmers have had from this program, and since the Senator has three or four times referred to the Florida situation, I want to refer to the Maine situation, because it is clear that the potato growers in Maine have been the chief offenders, bringing the price-support house down about the ears of the potato producers of the Nation.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I had just said that I should prefer to conclude my remarks, after which I should be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida declines to yield at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while speaking on this point, I should like to place in the RECORD the figures given me yesterday by Mr. Claude S. Morris, of the potato section of the United States Department of Agriculture, giving the facts of the situation in Florida through February 20. I do not have the figures down to February 22, because yesterday afternoon this was the latest compilation available. Up to that date, Mr. President, of the present crop of Florida potatoes the Department of Agriculture, under its price-support program in Florida, had bought 11,221 sacks, which at 1⅔ bushels to the sack, makes 18,702 bushels of potatoes, or a little less than 4 percent of the amount marketed up to that time. In order that the RECORD may show what was done with those potatoes and the affirmative fact that none of them had to be destroyed, here is a break-down of what was done with them:

Nine hundred and fifty sacks were acquired by the school-lunch program.

Eight thousand five hundred and seventy-three sacks were acquired for the feeding of livestock in areas closely adjoining the production area.

One thousand six hundred and ninety-eight sacks went to penal institutions, State and local, close by.

In each instance the sales represent f. o. b. sales, either to the school-lunch

program or to the other recipients, without any added expense for the Department of Agriculture or for the people of the United States, but, to the contrary, with some nominal returns.

The purchase of 11,221 sacks, or 18,722 bushels, represents, as I understand, a little less than 4 percent of that portion of the Florida crop which has been marketed since January 18 when the first purchase of this year's crop was made, or in the period of January 18 to February 20, inclusive. I would not have it appear that those figures represent the full purchases this year, because the marketing is still under way.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether the potatoes which have already been purchased in Florida, with the exception of those furnished to the school-lunch program and those diverted to livestock feeding, were potatoes which could not be marketed under the marketing order?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would depend upon what the order required.

Mr. AIKEN. The inference would be that probably the potatoes did not qualify for regular sales under the marketing order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe a marketing order prevails at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I was asking for information.

Mr. HOLLAND. As to whether it would be affected by the terms of any marketing order would depend entirely upon the terms of the order.

Mr. AIKEN. There are, as the Senator from Florida knows, a great many good potatoes which are not put upon the market because of marketing orders but which are classed as No. 1, or No. 2 potatoes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Continuing on this subject, I think it would be informative to the Senate and to the Nation to have appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation covering the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, and the operation during those years of the potato price-support program by States throughout the Nation. This tabulation has been compiled, as I understand, from the files of the PMA, F. and V., the Potato Division, and other branches of the Department of Agriculture, and is dated September 20, 1949. I offer it for the RECORD at this time.

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

Potatoes: Surplus removal, 1945–48

State	Quantity purchased (in thousands of bushels)					Percent of crop purchased				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1945–48 average	1945	1946	1947	1948	1945–48 average
						Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Maine	5,999	35,868	14,310	42,706	24,721	11	46	23	58	34
New York:										
Long Island	1,129	9,306	5,366	9,273	6,268	6	39	27	49	30
Up-State		2,032		7,163	2,299		11		37	12
Pennsylvania	48	730	277	2,215	817		4	2	11	4
Michigan	1,344	2,749	437	2,601	1,783	7	15	4	16	10
Wisconsin	216	598	27	2,053	724	2	5		19	6
Minnesota	2,419	4,052	1,276	4,380	3,032	13	23	9	26	18
North Dakota	2,849	6,575	522	6,975	4,230	12	35	3	34	21
South Dakota	402	757	137	961	564	14	27	7	38	22
Nebraska	507	727	134	615	496	4	6	2	5	4
Montana	7	261	1	682	238		12		28	10
Idaho	61	5,935	4	9,490	3,872		13		22	9
Wyoming	47	507	5	385	236	2	20		16	10
Colorado	761	1,768	536	7,690	2,689	4	9	3	37	13
Utah	1	597	2	930	382		18		32	12
Nevada	13	100		77	48	2	15		26	11
Washington	23	1,514		5,701	1,809		15		49	16
Oregon		1,523	5	2,905	1,108		11		25	9
California (late)		557		2,953	878		4		20	6
New Hampshire		205		162	92		16		17	8
Vermont		147	10	312	117		11	1	24	9
Massachusetts	174	805	800	1,355	783	6	22	25	38	23
Rhode Island	16	315	336	508	294	1	18	22	35	19
Connecticut	31	792	600	760	546	1	18	18	23	15
West Virginia										
Ohio		107	3	532	160		1		8	2
Indiana		63		158	55		1		4	1
Illinois										
Iowa	30	180	13	157	95	1	6	1	11	5
New Mexico	4	43			12	1	13			4
New Jersey	2,822	4,985	5,659	8,273	5,435	23	35	43	64	41
Delaware		122	75	33	58		35	22	15	18
Maryland	34	727	540	300	400	4	62	49	30	36
Virginia	16	3,048	1,701	4,000	2,191		41	27	47	29
Kentucky										
Missouri		32	15	162	52		4	5	29	10
Kansas	21	23	32	27	26	4	3	5	4	4
Arizona	10	887		78	244	1	51		4	14
North Carolina		4,228	683	3,323	2,058		55	14	51	30
South Carolina		255	198	200	163		10	11	25	12
Georgia		48	25	7	20		9	6	3	4
Florida		510	77	8	149		9	3		3
Tennessee		225	4		57		31	1		8
Alabama		655	117	130	226		21	6	5	8
Mississippi		290	9	3	76		71	5	3	20
Arkansas		210	3		53		40	1		10
Louisiana		75	8	12	24		6	1	1	2
Oklahoma		93	16	8	29		78	27	9	28
Texas	647	1,122	628	482	720	21	25	19	14	20
California (early)		8,432	199	2,762	2,848		25	1	9	9
Total	19,631	104,780	34,790	133,507	73,177	5	23	10	32	18
Fiscal branch	22,835	107,870	34,193							

Commercial early production only in early and intermediate States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that there may be at least some discussion in the RECORD as to what is contained in this complete compilation, I want to advert, first, to the Florida situation. It is shown that in the year 1945, no potatoes were purchased in Florida under the price-support program by the United States Department of Agriculture. It is shown that in 1946, 9 percent of the crop of that year was purchased, that in 1947, 3 percent of the crop of that year was purchased, and that in 1948, the last year covered by the compilation, less than a single percent of Florida potatoes were purchased under the program. That resulted in a total average of 3 percent, covering the 4 years of production of potatoes in the State of Florida, being purchased under the price-support program during those 4 years of operation.

I should like to have that in the RECORD, because I want it to be crystal clear that the area in Florida which produces Irish potatoes has not been an offender against the planning for the potato industry which was laid down in Congress and which, through the price-support program, has offered assistance to potato

growers, for which the potato growers should have been grateful. I believe that in most cases they have been grateful.

The Senator from Maine has on three occasions made reference to what happened in Florida. For that reason I think it is only fair that the RECORD should show what happened in Maine in these same 4 years under the price-support program. In 1945 a total of 11 percent of the production in Maine was bought by the United States Department of Agriculture. In 1946, 46 percent of the Maine production was bought by the Department of Agriculture. In 1947, 23 percent of the Maine potatoes was so purchased. In 1948, 58 percent, or considerably more than half the production of Irish potatoes in Maine, was bought by the Department of Agriculture.

For the 4 years in question, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, the average of the production of Maine potatoes which had to be bought up by the Department of Agriculture in pursuance of the price-support program, was 34 percent of the total production of potatoes in that very fine potato-producing State.

I am told that the figures for 1949, when available, will even increase that figure. I do not state that of my own information, or from this compilation, because I do not have the latest figures on what happened in Maine in 1949. However, I do want it to be very clear that that is the comparative situation between these two States, which have had much cause to be grateful to a Government which has been trying to let them down easy after the war increase, when in the interest of war production the potato growers of the Nation were urged to increase production, and later were given the benefit of the so-called Steagall amendment, and subsequently other legislation, in order to enable them to adjust themselves to postwar conditions.

I shall not read the figures with reference to any other State. They will appear in the RECORD. The whole compilation which I have mentioned has been introduced into the RECORD.

Mr. President, I may say further that the Secretary of Agriculture, on his appearance before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with reference to certain of the late producing areas, including the State of Maine, said that the overproduction in the last year, which was very great—as I recall, about 15,000,000 bushels beyond what was calculated to be produced in Maine in 1949—resulted, at least in large part, from the fact that potato growers had increased the thickness of their planting, by diminishing the width of the rows, and perhaps by stepping up the thickness of the planting in the rows, and likewise, by increasing the fertilization of the potatoes thus planted. So I want it to be very clear that not the potato industry as a whole, but particular parts of it—and the potato industry in Maine is not the only portion which has offended against the program—in large measure are to blame for the troubles which have come upon the industry. I want that statement to be in the RECORD immediately following the showing of the attitude of the Irish potato industry in the State of Florida, which has said in so many words that it is sick and tired of the whole business and would like to see price supports entirely terminated.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in the first place, I certainly regret any differences which may exist between the State of Florida and the State of Maine on this subject. Certainly I do not want the RECORD to show that the State of Maine was responsible for raising any such issue. The first mention I heard of it was in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when the Senator from Florida, in pursuance of his obvious responsibility, raised the question regarding the State of Maine. Naturally, I was somewhat sensitive regarding it. Certainly we are in accord in wanting an amicable solution of this problem. I should like to say—and I think the Senator from Florida will confirm the correctness of the statement—that last year the Nation as a whole reduced its potato production by approximately 10 percent. Is that correct, according to the Senator's figures? Is it correct that the production was reduced from 450,000,000 bushels to 402,000,000 bushels? That was somewhat more than a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it correct that the State of Maine reduced its production by approximately the same percentage, from 72,000,000 bushels to something in the neighborhood of 66,000,000 bushels? In other words, that is approximately a 10-percent reduction in the production of potatoes in the State of Maine.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will let me state the figures, the Maine production was 74,305,000 bushels in 1948, and 67,065,000 bushels in 1949.

Mr. BREWSTER. Which is approximately 7,000,000 bushels less, or approximately a 10-percent reduction. In other words, the State of Maine reduced its production of potatoes by almost exactly the same amount as the national average.

I further point out that weather conditions, of course, affected the situation. Our growing season happened to be favored by good weather conditions. South Dakota had bad weather conditions. So there is a certain latitude to be taken into consideration. I think it is also fair to have in the RECORD—although I realize the Senator from Florida has some mitigating circumstances to point out—that the State of Florida last year had increased its potato production from the preceding year by 40 percent. I realize the explanation which the Senator from Florida has as to that. However, that increase of between one and two million bushels was, of course, a factor in bringing about the present situation.

It seems to me fair also to point out that the overproduction in Florida was approximately 169 percent, again undoubtedly the result of favorable growing weather conditions and the restricted production in the 1948 season.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Maine himself, some days ago, brought in on the floor of the Senate these figures affecting Florida, and I have not seen fit to make any reply until today, though I told the Senator privately what the explanation was, and he well knows what it is.

As a matter of fact, in the production year 1948, which included the winter of 1947–48, so far as Florida production was concerned, we were just coming out from under the water of the worst flood Florida has ever had, and we had limited production that year, as the Senator well knows, not only in the field of potatoes, but in other fields. Therefore, there does appear the large increase in production of potatoes in Florida between the two years.

However, I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that, in the first place, that is not the real measure of the compliance with the program of 1949 exhibited by the respective areas. The program of 1949 reduced the acreage of potatoes, and did so in the effort to reduce the production of potatoes. The figures calculated by the Department of Agriculture as to the prospective production from each State better show the goals to which each area was progressing.

In the case of Florida, the goal advanced by the Department of Agriculture, based on the average production in Florida over the years 1938 to 1947, was 4,240,00 bushels, whereas the actual production was 5,428,000 bushels, or, let us say, the actual production was up 1,200,000 bushels.

In the case of Maine, the goal presented was 52,758,000 bushels, whereas the actual production was 67,060,000 bushels, up, therefore, 14,500,000 bushels from the goal which had been presented to Maine, and which was defeated, at least in large part, by reason of the overplanting and the overfertilization to which I have already referred.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator indicate the figures as to the amount of increase in each State in support received?

Mr. HOLLAND. The actual figures indicate that at no time has the State of Florida impinged heavily on the support-price program, or realized heavily from it, or had to sell any large proportion under it. The figures show that for the 4 years the part of the Florida production which had to be supported by purchase by the Government was 3 percent, whereas the same figure for the State of Maine was 34 percent during the same period. As I stated to the Senator a few moments ago, my information is that when the 1949 history is written the figure may go up very heavily, even above the 34 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is a very able and diligent member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am not a member of that committee, but, as a matter of information, if the Senator has available in his tables the figures as to Virginia and Maryland, comparing the 2 years, I should like to

know what the situation was, so that I might move, if we are in error, to help correct the error.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to furnish the Senator the compilation, which appears from a crop-production report as of December 1949 of the United States Department of Agriculture. If the Senator would like to have the figures for Maryland, I shall be glad to give them.

In the case of Maryland the 1948 production was 1,965,000 bushels. The 1949 production was 1,587,000 bushels. The goal toward which Maryland was working was 2,037,000 bushels. In other words, Maryland in 1949 is well under both its production goal and its production for the prior year, 1948. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has answered the question. I did not know what the figures were, but I am highly gratified to know that the potato farmers of Maryland have not contributed to the surplus which is costing so much money, and resulted in so many bushels of potatoes going unused.

I wonder if the Senator would likewise give me the figures as to Virginia, because the potato-growing section in Maryland, the lower Eastern Shore, primarily, and much of the potato-growing area of Virginia, abut. I was wondering whether this cycle which the Senator has defined for Maryland carried over into Virginia for the years mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator, basing my statement upon the same crop report which I have just mentioned, that a similar performance is shown in the Virginia Irish potato industry for the 2 years in question, 1948 and 1949, as shown in Maryland, and I give the figures as follows: the 1948 production in Virginia was 11,529,000 bushels. In 1949 it was 9,126,000 bushels. The goal which was presented, based upon the several years' average preceding, and on the reduced acreage, was 8,808,000 bushels. So that in the case of Virginia, Virginia produced about 300,000 bushels more than the goal, but more than 2,000,000 bushels less than the production for 1948.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him if he knows, now that the planting part of the potato season is here, of any other way that we can adequately deal with the matter on an immediate basis so as to serve notice on the industry, other than in some such substantial form as the Senator from Illinois has proposed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator that in the committee a majority of the members felt—and the Senator from Florida was one of that majority—that the proposal of the Senator from Illinois would serve notice, and afford an adequate period of time, for correction of the situation by including the provision—and I quote from the Lucas amendment:

> No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution.

There is a considerable time elapsing, of course, between planting and marketing, and it was felt that that period of time was adequate to force the problem to an issue. But I say to the Senator again what I said before he came to the floor, that it was never for a moment contemplated by the committee, nor in the arguments advanced by the Senator from Illinois and others who supported the amendment, to have a fixed cut-off date at the time of the enactment of the new law so as to deprive persons who were then operating under the program of the chance of any benefits from the support for a period of weeks, or perhaps a couple of months, and then bring back the other producers of the Nation, after the corrective legislation was passed, under the terms of the price-support program. Such an idea never entered into the mind of the junior Senator from Florida, and never entered into the discussion of the matter in the committee. I am sure there was not a member of the committee who wanted it on that basis, because, to the contrary, the amendment, as voted, makes it very clear that this leeway, this warning, was given by exempting from the exclusion from price support, potatoes which had actually been planted before the enactment of the law, and including within the purview of the amendment, as proposed, potatoes which were planted after the enactment of the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I take it also that the great potato-producing areas of America are for the most part in the northern part of the United States. In other words, the areas from which potatoes are usually harvested are above rather than below the Potomac on a line running across the country. Is that observation correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The fact of the matter is that the State of California is one of the great producing areas. It has two areas—an upper and a lower area. I read for instance, just for the RECORD, the figures of production of the early potato area in California in 1949. It was 30,030,000 bushels. In the late potato area, 16,200,000 bushels. Or a total production of potatoes in that State in the year 1949 of 46,000,000 bushels of potatoes as compared with the heaviest production of all, that of the State of Maine, 67,000,000 bushels.

Mr. TYDINGS. However, while there were exceptions to the general observation the Senator from Maryland made, is it not a fact that the upper half of the United States produces more potatoes than the lower half of the United States does, as shown by past history?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that is correct, and it is certainly correct east of the Mississippi.

Mr. TYDINGS. While I should like to see a policy that would not put one part of the country at any disadvantage compared to other parts of the country, I think we are on the horns of this dilemma. We must either look forward confidently to a repetition of what we have been complaining about, on the one hand, or making up our minds to deal instantaneously with it and correct as much of it as we can, upon the other hand. Certainly if we do not do anything to deal with the situation until another year, if we do not give notice to the industry which has not yet started its planting season, it seems to me that we will be open to a charge of bad faith if later on we tried to do it. And, in the second place, if we do not deal with the situation now, or later on, we will have a tremendous possibility of another large potato surplus, which will result in a great cost to the country. Many of the potatoes will rot. Is that wrong or right as shown by the evidence produced before the Senator's committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. The evidence before the committee showed that as to 1949 production too much of it is excess, and will either rot or be used for some inconsequential purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. And for the possibilities of 1950, without the Lucas amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. Without the Lucas amendment, or without some amendment which would bring early correction of the situation into play.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question. I will be through in a moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to ask the Senator the question because I know he is very well informed on the subject.

We receive the impression that the evidence before the committee, which was adduced by the Department of Agriculture and others interested in this program, is to the effect that the early potato is not as much of a contributing factor to the surplus as the potatoes which are grown later. Is that correct or not? Before the Senator answers I may say that we have formed that assumption upon the belief that when early potatoes come in there are not so many of them, and the consumption pretty well keeps up with the supply. But when the whole harvest comes in there is such a great amount of potatoes that that is the time when most of the surplus accumulates, since potatoes are not a commodity which can be stored for a long period of time. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator that in general his observations are correct, as I understand the facts. The facts, as shown by the compilation which I just placed into the RECORD, and which has gone to the reporters, so I do not have it before me, show that for the 4 years immediately prior to 1949 only 3 percent of the total production in Florida had to be bought by the Department of Agriculture under the price-support program. I am sorry I cannot give the figures for Georgia and Alabama, but they were very close to that. My recollection is that it was 4 percent in one of those States and 8 percent in the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. So the conclusion, then, to flow from what the Senator has said is that the production there is almost immediately demandable and consumable, wheras when we get the full harvest later on from the section which produces more than half, that is the time when we are confronted, rather than in the beginning of the season, with the surplus problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Of course, there are two other factors which enter into the matter. After people have gone through a hard winter, when they have the opportunity to obtain a fresh vegetable, particularly of the uniform excellence of Irish potatoes as produced in Florida, they simply cannot resist the temptation to buy heavily and to eat heartily. Therefore there is a good, firm, demand for a fresh product. But, with all inclination to claim that as the sole reason, I would have to say to the Senator that there is another very compelling factor in this matter, which is that those early potatoes are not susceptible of being stored for long periods of time. They are quite succulent and quite watery, and they are therefore produced by an industry which knows that the potatoes have to be consumed very promptly after they are harvested.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree that the greater part of the cash expense in producing potatoes comes from the cost of seed and fertilizer, and that expense is incurred a considerable time before the actual planting of the potato takes place. Undoubtedly at the present time the potato growers of the State of the Senator from Maryland have incurred the major part of their cash expense in producing their potatoes.

Therefore, if the support were limited only to those potatoes which are planted at the time the joint resolution becomes law, which probably could be the early part of next week, they would have incurred the expense, and a few States along the southern tier of States would be guaranteed support, and all the States north of that, even though they had incurred the expense, would not be in a position to receive the support.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment. I desire to answer the Senator from Vermont. I think the Senator has overlooked the fact that he has included in his proposed amendment exactly the same factor that is in the Lucas amendment; that is:

> No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes—

And I accent these words—

> planted after the enactment of this joint resolution.

In other words, the Senator in the drafting of his amendment is following exactly the line of thought which prevailed in the committee. We were trying to fix a period of time in which we felt that a better situation could be brought about and enforced.

I may say that I was with the Senator from Vermont in his feeling that we should not limit ourselves to the enactment of new marketing-quota legislation, but we should give both the Secretary of Agriculture and, particularly, the industry—because it had this available before, but did not accept it—the opportunity to come under marketing orders which would be entered, as I understand, only after two-thirds of the producers in the area affected voted to do so.

Therefore, Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont felt that we should have two procedures open, as follows: The one already open under the law; the other, the one to be approached under the law. I was in thorough agreement with that approach; but I called to his attention the fact that the time factor in the Lucas amendment, which will protect those who already had gone so far that they need protection, is identical with that provided in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to explain——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida yields to the Senator from Vermont, if he will permit me to comment on the Senator's observation as it affects my own State, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, in order to permit the Senator from Maryland to make answer to the observation of the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the Senator from Maryland is aware of the fact that many potato farmers have bought their seed and have placed their orders for fertilizer, as the Senator has said; and it is regrettable that a few of them may be penalized in some degree by that circumstance. But as I understand the proposition, the only way we can keep the potato program going is to get for it the public support throughout the entire country that it must have if it is to survive.

So we are confronted with the question of whether we shall injure to only a small degree the people in the potato seed and fertilizer field, on the one hand, or whether we are going to allow the situation to fester to such an extent that public demand will be such that the program is likely to be swept away.

The fertilizer the farmer has purchased will not be lost at all. There is no ground for assuming that the fertilizer he has bought cannot be used profitably on his farm. If he would reduce his acreage even one-tenth or one-twentieth, or whatever is required, by planting that much less seed, he would not lose all the seed, as is implied by the Senator's observation; on the contrary, he would lose only a small percentage of the seed.

Therefore, it seems to me that what he would get by trying to meet the difficulties which now confront the Congress and the country, on the one hand, by the adoption of the program now under consideration would so far outweigh in its over-all benefits to him the very small mite that he would lose by helping to conform to the situation and to put the agricultural program in balance, that although the argument which has been made in his behalf is one which should be considered and should receive some weight, I do not believe it is in the sphere of being really determinative, in the final solution, of this problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to reply?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In reply to the Senator from Maryland, I would remind him that the Secretary of Agriculture has already made an agreement with the potato farmers throughout the country and already has set the price for the coming year at 96 cents a bushel, as compared with $1.08 last year. He already has limited the number of acres they can plant, and that will constitute a reduction of 86,000 acres from the acreage allotment last year; and he already has advised the potato farmers that they must market their potatoes in an orderly manner, as approved by the Department of Agriculture, in order to qualify for any support at all. That should result in a reduction of somewhat more than 10 percent in the potatoes marketed—which the Senator from Maryland thinks would be a fair amount.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think all those things are very fine contributing factors to limiting the difficulty in the future. But the fact remains, I should like to point out to the Senator, that I do not know of a small thing—I say that in a relative sense—that has so aroused the housewives and consumers in the towns and cities of the United States as the fact that we are appropriating more money to produce more food than can be consumed, and it is going to waste. People do not like that. Whenever we meet a situation of that kind, we are confronted with an actuality, not a theory. Unless that condition is remedied, there will be growing opposition to the entire agricultural program, much of which can be justified.

I say now to the Senator that no one is attempting to pick out the potato industry and sandbag it over the head and leave it lying prostrate in the road. But we must be fair enough to promulgate the policies which will keep the potato industry on a parity with other agricultural industries, and not at the same time bring down on its head the wide wave of justifiable criticism which has been encountered in view of the practices followed in the past, and perhaps for the year to come.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to reply, let me say it is not difficult to agree with that statement of the Senator from Maryland. But the position I would take, and I am sure it is the one the Senator from Maryland would take, is that once having made an agreement, the United States Government should not repudiate it with one segment of our people, any more than it would be justified in repudiating an agreement with a foreign nation. An agreement which is made should be kept.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has a point there.

Nevertheless, his other alternative is this: Would the potato farmer prefer to have his tentative and pending agreement abrogated to a small extent now, with the result that he could continue to have this beneficial agreement continued in the future with the support of

the people of America; or would he prefer to stick to a strict, legal conformity, and as a result gather additional ill will of the American people, and face the prospect of having no reasonable agreement in the future?

What we are doing here should be for the benefit of both the potato farmers and the consumers and taxpayers of America. The potato farmer is all three of those; he is both a potato producer, a consumer, and a taxpayer. Unless he, too, like the rest of us, takes the long-range view of the matter, and unless we proceed on that basis, we shall be doing him a real disservice if we insist upon a continuation of a program which is causing widespread disapproval among the people of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may reply further to the Senator from Maryland, with the permission of the Senator from Florida, let me say that I think the Department of Agriculture, in the light of the last 3 years' experience, is attempting this year to bring the supply of potatoes into line with the demand.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, it is doubtful whether that can ever be done exactly; for if we are to be sure that we shall have sufficient potatoes for human consumption in the United States, it is likely that we shall have to plan upon raising a few more than we need each year in order to guard against unfavorable weather conditions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, my final comment to the Senator from Vermont—if the Senator from Florida will permit—is just this: We must not lose sight of the fact that when our Government makes contracts with potato farmers it represents all the people of America, and it also has an implied contract with all the people of America not to use their hard-gained earnings, which it siphons off in part in the form of taxes, to continue a program which encourages the production of food in such volume that large parts of it, after it is created, simply rot. If that situation develops, then the consumer says to himself or to herself, "Why should I pay taxes to a government that has a program that destroys millions of dollars' worth of good food?"

In short, Mr. President, every Member of Congress has a running and continuing implied contract with them that we will not squander their money, and, in my opinion, that contract is just as binding as the express contract we make with any particular group of our citizens.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to permit a final brief comment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that the Lucas amendment does not propose to repudiate in a small way part of the agreement made with the potato farmers of the country; it simply proposes to repudiate entirely the agreement made with the potato farmers, but not to repudiate the agreements made with other farmers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, let me say that if we keep on as we have proceeded in the past year, we shall repudiate our implied contract with the taxpayers of the United States not to siphon off their tax dollars and let them go down the drain. I think we must take steps to avoid doing that.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that remark would have been in order at any time during the past 10 or 15 years.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senators for their observations. I shall attempt to conclude my remarks in a few minutes.

It seems to me that what is being proposed by the Lucas amendment—and I am a party to it—is to try to bring this matter to a head within a reasonable period of time, so that by that time corrective legislation can be enacted.

It was never intended to shut off the support program entirely to the portion of the industry which happened to be active now, and then bring the support program back into effect 60 days from now to the portion of the industry which happens to be located farther north in the United States.

Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Georgia and also the Senator from Alabama have just reentered the Chamber. I call the particular attention of those Senators to the fact that their own States are shown by the compilation I have placed in the RECORD not to have been serious offenders against the price-support program, not to have abused it, not to have relied heavily upon it for the purchasing of any large proportion of the Irish potato production of their own States.

I do not have to call to the attention of those Senators the fact that in their States the Irish potatoes are already planted, they are already in the ground, and that if the amendment of the Senator from Delaware should be adopted, and then, following that, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, we would have a situation under which their States and all similarly located, in which plantings have already taken place or in which marketing may even be going on, as is now the case in Florida, would find themselves completely cut out of the program, looking to the day, 60 days from now, or 90 days from now, whenever it may be, when corrective legislation should pass, thereby bringing into the program and back to the farmers in the large producing areas of the Nation, the benefit of a price-support program, which would have been thus completely denied to the Irish potato producers of Georgia and Alabama, in part to the Irish potato producers of Florida, and in part to the producers of Louisiana, southern California, south Texas, and other areas, which have already planted or which may be nearly production.

Mr. President, let me say to Senators that insofar as the direct effect upon the potato industry of the State of Florida is concerned, it will be decidedly less than it will be upon the potato industry in the States that are a little farther north. I stated in the beginning of my argument that the marketing of the Florida crop was begun in January, that it has already come along a good way; that in the very nature of things, before the legislation can pass and become law, it will have come still further along, and while a part of the industry of my State will be affected, I call to the attention of Senators the fact that many States will be affected as to their entire production. As to them the adoption of the Williams' amendment would in effect stay entirely any price-support program until a fairer one can be worked out. It would not cut off a price-support program for all areas in the Nation from this time forth, but instead, would simply work undue hardship upon areas that will be marketing before the remedial legislation can be passed and placed in effect.

I note on the floor the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who made some comment on this phase of the situation yesterday, and I should like to advance for his consideration this particular aspect of the matter. He spoke yesterday of the fact that no legislator ever surrenders the right to terminate legislation which he thinks is operating in a way which is not to the good and to the benefit and for the general welfare of his country. Of course, no one could argue the point with him, because he is so right in it. But I call to his attention two facts which he may have overlooked. First, the fact that the offer as made last November by the Secretary of Agriculture, the official agent of the United States Government named in the legislation passed by the Congress to represent it in this program, stated there would be a price-support program, and that that program would be available to potato growers of the various States of the Nation who would reduce their acreage by amounts which he named and would comply with other provisions and conditions which he prescribed. When there has been actual reduction of acreage and when there has been compliance with these terms and when the expense of the growing of the crop has already been sustained—in the State of Florida it has been fully sustained, all except the marketing in that part of the crop which has not been marketed and in the States immediately north of Florida, it has been sustained in large part—it seems to me that a strong case is made for the essential morality of the recognition of the situation and of the allowance of a proper period of time, as is allowed by the Lucas amendment, in which remedial legislation can be passed, but without bringing any deprivation to those growers who have thus accepted the offer made by the Government and through its agent, without removing from them the protection of the system which they have earned by complete compliance with the conditions stated to them. The acreage reductions in my own State have not been heavy, but they have been a good deal heavier on the growers who were producing last year than is shown by the figure of over-all reduction of 3 percent, which is applied by the order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

As I happen to know from having been active in the matter some weeks or months ago, when the question was

ironed out, there were a goodly number of new growers, particularly servicemen, who wanted to come into the picture, and their acreage had to be considered and taken into account out of the reduced acreage allowed to the State as a whole. I am unable to say what the reduction was on the growers who produced in last year and in prior years, but it is a good deal more than the 3 percent which is set forth in the order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The order of the Secretary of Agriculture as affecting Georgia and Alabama, required a reduction of 7 percent, and I believe that the average reduction required all over the Nation was about 7 percent. It seems to the junior Senator from Florida that a strong, moral case is made in behalf of the continued recognition by the Congress and by the Nation of a situation under which citizens have been offered a proposal which they have accepted and acted upon, and have spent their money and time and employed their labor in growing a crop which has been produced in accord with the proposal of the Government. There is, it seems to me, a very strong, moral question as to whether properly action can now be taken which cuts them off, but still looks forward to the time, 60 or 90 days hence, when the program may be reinstated by remedial legislation to all others in the Nation who happen to plant and produce their crops a little later in the year. Mr. President, if there is any morality in that sort of action, I find it difficult to see it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator from Florida any assurance that legislation including marketing orders will be enacted in regard to potatoes? Does he see any possibility of getting marketing-order legislation enacted this year in time to take effect on the present crop before it is planted?

Mr. HOLLAND. Marketing-order legislation is already in effect, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. AIKEN. I mean quota legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Because I felt the quota legislation probably could not be made applicable as early as the other, I am in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. As the Senator will recall, in committee, I voted for the amendment, first.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Only when the marketing order part was eliminated did I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. It seems to me that earlier action is possible through the marketing-order procedure than is available under the establishment of quotas. But it seems to me also that if the potato industry finds it wholly to its interest and welfare, as I believe it to be, it will come here almost as one man to insist upon the enactment, and the early enactment of the quota legislation, which will free it from the very just censure of the great public of the United States, who feel that this program, remedial in its effect and designed to help farmers, has been grossly abused by at least certain factions and factors of the Irish-potato industry.

Mr. AIKEN. Then do I correctly understand that the Senator from Florida feels that an improvement can be made by reliance upon marketing orders for the year 1950?

Mr. HOLLAND. By reliance in part upon marketing orders. The Senator from Florida, by no manner of means, wants to cut himself off from the possibility of enactment of quota legislation, because he thinks it is so tremendously needed that the Congress should give it time and attention immediately to its enactment.

Mr. AIKEN. I confess I did not understand the Senator from Florida when I was on the other side of the Chamber. Do I understand that the Senator will approve the amendment which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may enforce the marketing orders for this year?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not marketing quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. No; that is true. We hope the marketing orders will suffice for future years, too.

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated as clearly as I could that I was in support of the approach embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which added to the available remedy of marketing orders, which is at once available, a quota system which should be made available under speedy legislation action, and that the quota legislation was, in the judgment of the Senator from Florida, the most powerful, the most effective, the most helpful, and that we should press immediately for its enactment, though at the same time we would hope that real progress would be made under the marketing-order procedure.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the able Senator from Florida. I think we are in agreement both as to the importance of the use of marketing orders, and then the enactment of legislation which will provide for marketing quotas, in the event the Secretary finds it needful to control the production and marketing of the crop in another year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida with his characteristic fairness and integrity, has referred to the question of the moral principle involved in the prospective legislation. I am sure he has made a very strong case for the growers who have relied, in reducing their acreage, upon the announcement made to them, as I understand, by the Secretary of Agriculture. I should say the Senator's argument is one of especial force, and appeals, of course, to the innate sense of equity and justice in the heart and mind, I trust, of every one of us. I agree with him as to the general rule. As indicated yesterday in the debate, there has been the general rule. According to the statement introduced in evidence here by the Senator from Maine, it has been a general rule, followed by the Department, not to change rules or assurances during a given crop season. It was pointed out in the debate yesterday, however, that there have been various exceptions to the rule. I submit most respectfully, Mr. President, that regardless of the fact that inequities may result to the individual grower, to whom the Senator from Florida has alluded, nevertheless the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make an assurance to the growers is strictly limited by the terms of the law under which he acts, and in the second place, any measure of this type—in fact, so far as I now see it, the most important measure passed by Congress, unless there be some specific limitation of time therein placed—is subject to the power and the duty of Congress, in the event the general public interest demands it, to repeal or amend the legislation, even though some injury may result to individuals because of such action.

To summarize my view in regard to the remarks of the Senator from Florida along this line, I think he presents a very strong case, entitling his argument to the very careful consideration of this body. I can well see that some would think the illustration he has offered to be controlling, and that we should not at this time change the law applicable to the growers. To my mind, we have, however, that duty not only to the individual growers, but to the entire Nation, to all the people of our country.

We have a situation in which wartime legislation has in recent years and recent months proved productive of bad results, productive of perhaps inefficient administration, certainly an administration which has aroused widespread public criticism. It appears to me that the heavy liability which rests upon the Government, which is another way of saying, upon all the people of the Nation, justifies the Members of Congress who shall consider that the duty of preserving the interests of all is superior to the duty of preserving the interests of some particular group. I say that the facts in the case warrant the exercise of discretion by the Members of Congress in determining which attitude they shall take with respect to the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I ask unanimous consent to ask a few questions of the Senator from Vermont in regard to his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I state to the Senator the understanding which I have of the purpose of the Lucas amendment as preliminary to the first question I desire to address to the Senator from Vermont. It is my understanding that the purpose of the Lucas amendment is to terminate, until the enactment of a quota law for potatoes, the liability of the Government arising from its obligations contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, to support prices of potatoes except as to those potatoes which shall already have been planted when the Lucas amendment, if adopted, shall go into effect.

I ask the Senator, first, whether his understanding of the purpose and effect

of the Lucas amendment is as I have just outlined.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator has stated the purpose correctly.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator from Vermont, also, whether, in his judgment, the liability of the Government to which I have referred can, if the Lucas amendment shall be enacted into law, be revived only by the enactment of a quota law for potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether he considers that the Lucas amendment is subject to the objection that inasmuch as there are now no quotas to potatoes provided for in exitsing law, there may be no price support for potatoes planted after the enactment of the Lucas amendment, because it is uncertain whether there will be a quota law passed for potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree completely with that statement.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator also, whether the Aiken amendment has as its purpose to limit the Government's liability arising from its obligations contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949 to support the price of potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be the effect of the amendment which the Senator from Vermont has offered. It would strengthen the hand of the Secretary of Agriculture by making mandatory the use of that provision of the law which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to require compliance with marketing orders as a qualification for price supports, and the Secretary is authorized by the law to deny price supports to those who do not comply with the marketing practices which he approves.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that the limitation of Government liability which would be brought about by the enactment of the Aiken amendment would not apply to potatoes planted before the enactment into law of the joint resolution?

Mr. AIKEN. Potatoes planted before the enactment of the joint resolution would be subject to the provisions of the law as it exists at the present time, the curtailment of acreage, the reduction in price support, and the requirement of marketing agreements which have been prescribed by the Secretary for the 1950 crop.

Mr. DONNELL. In order to be sure that I understand the Senator correctly, under the Agricultural Act of 1949, the price of early, intermediate, and late Irish potatoes, respectively, shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity prices therefor. Am I correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is a correct statement of the law, as I recall it.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator with respect to his own amendment, the Aiken amendment, which is very brief, and which reads as follows:

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.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont how his amendment would accomplish the purpose by limiting the Government's liability as to potatoes planted after the enactment into law of this joint resolution, and exactly how the resulting limitation would come about?

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements are already in effect in nearly all the potato-producing areas of the country, and it is understood that such agreements can be put into effect in any remaining potato-producing areas before harvesting gets underway. I should like to add that the Secretary, in his announcement of the 1950 potato support-price program said:

Growers are reminded that the development and use of marketing agreements and orders in all commercial producing areas will be a prerequisite and eligibility for price support.

In other words, he intends to require the marketing of commercial potatoes in accordance with marketing orders which he himself must approve, and he evidently believes that will be effective, or he would not have made any such requirement.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether the marketing orders to which his amendment refers are those which are provided for in section 5 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, which was approved on August 24, 1935?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not certain as to the section, but, knowing that the Senator from Missouri is always correct, I am sure he is correct in this case.

Mr. DONNELL. I assure the Senator that in many instances I am not correct. I think, however, the orders to which the distinguished Senator has referred are the ones I have mentioned as being in section 5.

Mr. AIKEN. I would certainly accept the statement of the Senator from Missouri about that.

Mr. DONNELL. That is my best judgment. I have not found any others referred to.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether there is any provision in the law creating the right of making marketing orders by which the acreage of potatoes can be required to be reduced.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The Secretary can withhold support from growers who fail to keep within their acreage allotments which he has already proclaimed. In fact, they were proclaimed last November. If they do not keep within the acreage allotments prescribed by the Secretary, if they do not market their crop in accordance with marketing orders approved by the Secretary, then they are not eligible for price support.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether the provisions of the orders as set forth in the section to which I have called his attention, section 5 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, relate only to limitations of quantities to be marketed or transported, to allotments of amounts which handlers may purchase, allotments of amounts which handlers may market or transport to various markets, that would determine or provide the methods for determining the surplus of such commodity and provide for the control and disposition of such surplus and for the establishing or providing for the establishing of preserved foods? I might say that I have very much abbreviated the terms, but I was reading from the language of section 5, and I am referring particularly to subdivisions A to E, both inclusive, of subdivision 6 of section 8–C created by section 5.

Is not that the sole content the orders may cover?

Mr. AIKEN. The matter of acreage allotments would not come under marketing agreements. It is the handling end of the marketing only which would come under those agreements. I am looking for the provision in the official document of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that covers the marketing orders, but acreage control is under another provision, which is covered by the grower's right to refuse support.

Mr. AIKEN. I have found the language in the document, published by the Department of Agriculture, which states:

Regulations for specialty crops, such as tree fruits, tree nuts, and vegetables, govern the quantity, quality, and rate of shipment from the producing area to all markets, but not the price. This control, however, tends to strengthen prices of the commodities under regulation.

As the Senator from Maine has stated, and as I have said, the matter of acreage allotment does not come under the marketing-agreement law, but is in the Agricultural Act of 1948, as continued in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the entire contents of subdivision 6, to which I have referred, which contains subdivisions A to E, both inclusive, relating to the contents of the orders under the appellation "Terms—other commodities."

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

(6) In the case of fruits (including pecans and walnuts but not including apples, and not including fruits, other than olives, for canning) and their products, tobacco and its products, vegetables (not including vegetables, other than asparagus, for canning) and their products, soybeans and their products, and naval stores as included in the Naval Stores Act and standards established thereunder (including refined or partially refined oleoresin), orders issued pursuant to this section shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions, and (except as provided in subsection (7)) no others:

(A) Limiting, or providing methods for the limitations of, the total quantity of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, produced during any specified period or periods, which may be marketed in or transported to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, during any specified period or periods by all handlers thereof.

(B) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the amount of such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may purchase from or handle on behalf of any and all producers thereof, during any specified period or periods, under a uniform rule based upon the

amounts produced or sold by such producers in such prior period as the Secretary determines to be representative, or upon the current production or sales of such producers, or both, to the end that the total quantity thereof to be purchased or handled during any specified period or periods shall be apportioned equitably among producers.

(C) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the amount of any such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each handler may market in or transport to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, under a uniform rule based upon the amounts which each such handler has available for current shipment, or upon the amounts shipped by each such handler in such prior period as the Secretary determines to be representative, or both, to the end that the total quantity of such commodity or product, or any grade, size, or quality thereof, to be marketed in or transported to any or all markets in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or so as directly to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof, during any specified period or periods shall be equitably apportioned among all of the handlers thereof.

(D) Determining, or providing methods for determining, the existence and extent of the surplus of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and providing for the control and disposition of such surplus, and for equalizing the burden of such surplus elimination or control among the producers and handlers thereof.

(E) Establishing, or providing for the establishment of, reserve pools of any such commodity or product, or of any grade, size, or quality thereof, and providing for the equitable distribution of the net return derived from the sale thereof among the persons beneficially interested therein.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question. His amendment, as I understand, instead of providing that no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution, unless marketing quotas shall be in effect with respect to such potatoes, offers the additional alternative that if marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes, the price support shall be made available. Am I correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. However, in order that there may be no misunderstanding or misinterpretation at all, I should like to insert in my amendment the words, "or marketing agreements and," so that my proposed amendment would read as follows:

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 agreements and marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

I simply add the words "or marketing agreements and." I do not think that adds anything to the joint resolution, because usually there are not marketing orders without marketing agreements, but in order to satisfy anyone who might be in doubt, there is no harm in inserting the words I have suggested, so as to read, "marketing agreements and marketing orders."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator whether or not Public Law No. 320, of 1935, does not only cover orders with marketing agreements, but orders with or without marketing agreements, so there may be orders, may there not, without marketing orders?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that may be so, but I do not know of any cases where it has been done, or may be done.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, this is my last question in this series of questions. As I understand from the Senator's earlier answer, the purpose of his amendment is to restrict the liability of the Government to maintain price supports as to potatoes and to restrict it as indicated, namely, that no such price support shall be made available unless either marketing quotas shall be hereafter authorized by law, or marketing orders, under the Agricultural Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I am unable to satisfy myself that the insertion by the Senator from Vermont of the provision granting price supports in the event marketing orders are in effect is going to insure any decrease in the liability of the Government.

The point I have in mind is this, and I shall try to state it as clearly as I can: The existing law, the Agricultural Act of 1949, particularly title 2, states the following:

The Secretary is authorized and directed to make available * * *.

The price of * * * potatoes shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity price therefor.

I see nothing in the act of 1949, from which I have quoted, which would limit the obligation of the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain that support price to potatoes which pass in commercial operations.

Does not the Senator from Vermont agree that under the 1949 law there is an obligation on the part of the Government to provide a price support for all potatoes, except possibly culls—which I understand are not good potatoes—regardless of whether or not they move in commerce, and, since we have here a marketing-order insertion in the Senator's amendment which applies, as I see it, only to matters relating to the commerce end of potatoes, the disposal of surplus, and the limitation of quantities to be marketed, I am unable to see where there is any restriction at all in the general obligation to provide price supports for all potatoes, because the orders, as I understand, simply refer to potatoes which either pass in these respective methods through commerce, or are to be disposed of as surpluses. In other words, if I may clarify it perhaps a little better than I have, on the one hand, as I see it, in the 1949 act, which is the present law, there is an obligation on the part of the Government to maintain a support price as to all potatoes, and the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, on the other hand, provides that no price support shall be made available for any potatoes unless either quotas or marketing orders come into effect. I see nothing under the marketing-order provision which limits the obligation of the Government under the general provision of the 1949 act. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Senator is quite correct, because in the same law, in the middle of page 4, paragraph (c) reads:

Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices—

It was clearly understood that marketing agreements would come under the heading "Marketing practices"—

(including marketing quotas when authorized by law), prescribed by the Secretary, may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Then, a marketing order, which follows a marketing agreement, is referred to, quoting from a Department bulletin:

Regulations for specialty crops, such as tree fruits, tree nuts, and vegetables, govern the quantity, quality, and rate of shipment from the producing areas to all markets, but not the price. This control, however, tends to strengthen prices of the commodities under regulation.

Mr. President, as I interpret that statement, potatoes which do not comply with the regulations or the marketing orders would not be supported. I am fully aware of the fact that there has been passed around today a statement that the Secretary says this is meaningless. If it is meaningless, why did the Secretary in his announcement of the potato price-support program on November 16, 1949, state:

Growers are reminded that the development and use of marketing agreements and orders in all commercial producing areas will be a prerequisite to eligibility for price support.

If that provision is meaningless, why is the Secretary using it for the 1950 crop? I wish to qualify my earlier statement. I do not know that the Secretary has made any such statement. It is simply a rumor which has been communicated to me recently.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, with the understanding that I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall state exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture has said in regard to marketing agreements:

Marketing agreements have very certain and very definite weaknesses and by no means——

Mr. AIKEN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. LUCAS. From a memorandum which has been prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. For him, or by him?

Mr. LUCAS. For me, on the very point under discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask when it was prepared?

Mr. LUCAS. I received it this morning, as a result of the very interesting debate which the Senator and I had yesterday about his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator expect to put the whole memorandum in the RECORD?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall put the whole memorandum in the RECORD, or anything else I have with respect to the potato situation, and which the Senator desires to have included in the RECORD. I now read from the memorandum:

> Marketing agreements have certain very definite weaknesses and by no means are a cure-all for the potato-support problem. The first weakness is that the Government still has price-support obligations on all withheld grades of potatoes—except culls—which are produced by eligible growers. Therefore, if there is a surplus, marketing agreements in themselves do not assist in any way in reducing the amount of that surplus. Although such agreements are beneficial to consumers, they do not directly benefit the Government insofar as reducing its obligations for any given amount of surplus.

That is the important point I have been emphasizing all through my argument. It does not relieve the Government of the United States from its obligations to the cooperators. It must support not only the potatoes that go to market but also the ones that are kept at home.

I quote further from the Secretary's memorandum:

> Another thing that marketing agreements will not accomplish is any positive control of surplus production. At present, the only effective measure for attempting to control production are the voluntary acreage allotments. Reduction of potato production from its recent average of over 400,000,000 bushels down to a reasonable supply figure is the primary problem at present. Marketing agreements can be used to control the merchantable grades and sizes which are moving into commercial channels but cannot be used to reduce the total surplus itself since under existing legislation the Government is responsible for supporting the price on all commercial grades of potatoes whether or not they are sold in commercial channels.

This statement verifies the argument which is being made by the very able Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Secretary express an opinion as to the desirability of terminating supports on all potatoes not planted at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. That does not have anything to do with the point we are discussing at all.

Mr. AIKEN. It has everything in the world to do with it.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly it has.

Mr. LUCAS. We are talking about the effect of the Senator's amendment, and what it means with respect to the present law. I told the Senator yesterday that what I am proposing to do by my amendment, I am doing on my own responsibility. The Senator read into the RECORD, as I recall, that the Secretary said that when he starts with a program he wants to go through with it. That is his opinion. I have a different idea about what ought to be done with potatoes. I am not consulting the Secretary on that particular point at all. But I did ask the Secretary about the marketing agreements. I have now read from the memorandum he wrote for me.

Mr. AIKEN. But does not the Secretary believe that requiring the use of marketing agreements and marketing orders as a qualification for price support will have a beneficial effect in handling the potato situation this year?

Mr. LUCAS. He says it will help the consumers, but it will not relieve the Government of its obligations with respect to payment of the money to the potato producers. That is the point the Senator from Illinois has been trying to stress all through the argument.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the interpretation by the Secretary is very valuable and enlightening at this time, because I take it to mean that he believes that if potato growers are required to keep No. 1 potatoes off the market, are prohibited from marketing them, in other words, that they should be reimbursed to the extent of the support level. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont knows there are certain standards prescribed by the Department of Agriculture which the potato grower is compelled to meet in order to get the potatoes into commercial channels. The potatoes which get into commercial channels are supported, and the potatoes which stay in the cellars at home, with the exception of 10 percent which are known as culls, are also supported. The trouble we are having at the present time is that the potatoes that are now in the cellars which cannot find a market are still costing the Government many millions of dollars.

Mr. DONNELL. Under the law, the price support applies to potatoes which are in the cellars as well as to those which are in the market.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire if the Secretary of Agriculture registered any objection to requiring the use of marketing agreements and marketing orders?

Mr. LUCAS. The Secretary of Agriculture does not make any suggestion along that line at all. The only thing the Secretary is saying is that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont is absolutely futile and useless because the Secretary is doing the very thing now under the present law that he would do under the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. The Senator's amendment does not do a single thing toward meeting the problem in which the Senator from Illinois is interested.

Mr. AIKEN. It is true that the Secretary is using that provision of the law, evidently expecting that it will work. I believe it will work. I think it would have worked if it had been applied last year. But I understand that the Department felt that there were extenuating circumstances which made it impracticable last year.

Mr. LUCAS. Regardless of what the Senator from Vermont thinks the Secretary of Agriculture should have done, or what I may think about it, the Secretary is at this very time following the same course as is provided for in the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. The Secretary advises me that the Senator's amendment will in no way whatsoever change the present policies of the Department of Agriculture. The Department is not empowered to take the course proposed by the Senator from Illinois and thereby save the taxpayers some 50 million, 60 million, or 70 million dollars this year on the 1950 crop. Regardless of what the Senator believes his amendment would accomplish, the Secretary of Agriculture is now pursuing the same course that the Senator by his amendment wants him to follow. Therefore the amendment would accomplish absolutely nothing so far as settling the problem is concerned.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I will simply say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will make mandatory the use of this provision in future years unless a law is enacted which provides for marketing quotas on potatoes. With the explanation made by the Senator from Illinois, I would come to the conclusion that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Senator from Vermont are pretty much in agreement as to how the 1950 crop of potatoes should be handled and supported.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. But I should like to strengthen the Secretary's hand by the adoption of my amendment. I am opposed to cutting off the support for all potatoes which are not planted up to this time, cutting it off arbitrarily after the Secretary has made an agreement to support the price, has named the price, and allocated the acres which can be planted in each State. I think I am entirely correct and consistent, and I believe the Secretary in the program he has laid out this year is on the right track, and is profiting from some of the mistakes made last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont if he does not believe that in the event we are going to repeal price supports on certain potatoes, it would be better to repeal price supports across the board?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct, but I do not think we ought to repudiate our agreement with the farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it is proposed to repeal price supports on potatoes, it

should be done in such a manner that the law could be enforced.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Government of the United States were to go back on its promise to some of the potato growers, it would be just as well for the Government to go back on its word to all the other potato growers.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to submit for the consideration of the Senate that, as I understand, under the Lucas amendment the price support for Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution is cut off. We know that that amendment would stop the obligation of the Government with respect to all Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution. The obligation will have ceased and terminated and under that amendment no further money will have to be paid by the Government.

Now as I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont offers another condition under which price supports shall be made available. He sees, of course, as we all do, that under the present condition of the law there is no requirement or provision for marketing quotas for potatoes. But the Senator from Vermont would permit a price support not only after the enactment of a new law, if one be passed, providing for marketing quotas, but he would permit—and I know he does it with the very best of intentions, and he may be correct, I am not sure of that—he would permit a price support to be made available for any Irish potatoes with respect to which marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect as to any potatoes, regardless of when planted.

Mr. AIKEN. Providing they comply with the acreage allotments which the Secretary has prescribed for this year, and marketing practices as prescribed by the Secretary.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say, Mr. President, that the proviso which the Senator proposes to place in the joint resolution, of course is to be found elsewhere in the law. I am not contradicting the Senator's statement. He may be quite correct. But as to the amendment, which seeks to attain the same objective in substance as does the amendment of the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. DONNELL. With respect to the determination of the restriction of the liability of the Government, as I see it, there is this difference between it and the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois absolutely terminates the Government's liability. The Senator from Vermont provides for a price support with respect to all potatoes concerning which marketing orders, under the act of 1937, are in effect.

Mr. BREWSTER. Marketing agreements.

Mr. DONNELL. The language is "marketing orders."

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements and marketing orders.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator say "marketing orders"?

Mr. AIKEN. It may be superfluous wording, but it does not hurt the amendment any, and it may satisfy some persons who may question the language.

Mr. DONNELL. The subject matter of the agreements would be substantially the same as the subject matter of the orders. The orders would be the same as agreements, would they not?

Mr. AIKEN. The orders are issued to the handlers by the Secretary of Agriculture, based upon an agreement with the handlers, but cannot take effect until the agreement is approved by 50 percent of the handlers and the orders are approved by two-thirds of the producers.

Mr. DONNELL. The point I make in that connection is this: It seems to me that under the terms of section 6, which I placed in the RECORD this afternoon, it is possible for every potato to be the subject of a price support, because of the fact that subdivisions (d) and (e) of the series of things that may be included in the marketing orders, cover all potatoes, not merely some of them, but all of them, because they refer, in the case of subdivision (d) to potatoes which are included in the surplus. And they include in the case of subdivision (e) those which may be put into reserve pools which are established.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. If I may, I should like to complete the statement of this point, and then I should like to have the views of the Senator from Vermont, because I may be incorrect, as I have said. I wish to pay tribute at this time to the fine ability and knowledge of the Senator from Vermont, exceeding mine by many, many fold, as I see it.

But here is an amendment which says that there can be price support for all potatoes with respect to which marketing orders and/or agreements are in effect.

I assume that the orders merely carry into effect the agreements; and the subject matter of the orders, as prescribed in the statute, may be sufficiently broad to include all potatoes.

Therefore, the minute the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is adopted, price support will be available—the words of the amendment are "shall be made available"—as to all potatoes with respect to which marketing orders are in effect, and the Secretary of Agriculture could put the marketing orders into effect, under subdivisions (d) and (e), relative to surpluses and pools, as to all potatoes.

So it seems to me that, on the one hand, we have the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which, regardless of any demerits it may have, has the merit of cutting of all liability as to price support for potatoes which are planted after its enactment; and, on the other hand, we have the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, which seeks to reduce the liability, but gives no assurance of any reduction of liability because, for the reasons indicated, the potatoes which must be covered by price support under his amendment may include all potatoes, not merely a small portion of them.

I shall certainly be glad to hear the Senator from Vermont on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall give the Senator from Missouri good reasons why the use of marketing agreements and marketing orders should be required. In the first place, the Secretary of Agriculture would not be utilizing that provision of the law this year unless he felt that some good would come from it.

In the second place, we must remember that sometimes marketing agreements and orders are necessitated because of the disorderly marketing of a commodity. For instance, if a market is overloaded, the price breaks, and drops below the support level.

We must also remember that if marketing agreements are required, a grower who does not abide by it is not entitled to any support at all.

We do not know what that amounts to. The Senator from Maine tells us that in the State of Maine last year approximately 2 percent of the potato producers did not comply with the potato program. The Secretary of Agriculture would deny them any support at all for their potatoes, or he could have done so last year, had he required the use of marketing agreements. That is where one considerable saving can be made.

If the Secretary of Agriculture does not use the provision of the law requiring marketing agreements and orders to be in effect, he would have to support the price of No. 1 and No. 2 potatoes for all growers. But if he does require it, then he has to support the market price only for the potatoes of growers who comply with the marketing order.

I do not know what it will amount to. I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture knows what it will amount to. I do not think anyone knows. But evidently the Secretary of Agriculture thinks it will amount to something, and I think it will amount to something; and I should like to have that provision in the law, so that it will have to be used in future years, following 1950, unless a marketing quota law is enacted at this session of Congress.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a further question: Does he not agree with me that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois does absolutely terminate the obligation for price support as to all potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution? There can be no doubt of that, can there—namely, that under the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, the liability of the Government for price support as to potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution is terminated. That is true under the Lucas amendment, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; under the Lucas amendment, that is entirely true.

Mr. DONNELL. But under the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, there is no absolute termination; there is a termination only as to such potatoes as are not embraced within the marketing orders or marketing agreements. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And we cannot tell what potatoes will or will not be embraced within the marketing orders or agreements. Is not that true?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have had handed to me an example of what we have been discussing with regard to marketing agreements and orders. In the Red River Valley there is a marketing agreement and a marketing order for the potato growers, and the order which is in effect prohibits the shipment of culls and No. 2 potatoes. The eligible grower can sell his No. 1 potatoes and his No. 2 potatoes, I understand, under price support; but the ineligible producer, the one who fails to go along, must keep his No. 2's at home, with no payment whatsoever.

The Senator from Missouri understands that, under the marketing agreement, if two-thirds of the producers agree to the marketing order, it automatically becomes binding on the rest of the growers in that area. If they refuse to comply with that order, they are denied support for the No. 2's and the culls.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with this final remark I shall yield the floor: It seems to me that we are confronted with a choice as between two amendments. One is the Lucas amendment, which absolutely terminates the liability of the Government for price support as to the potatoes planted after the enactment of the joint resolution. Let me say in that connection that I am inclined to favor the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, making the provision applicable to all potatoes harvested after the enactment of the joint resolution, in which event the cessation of the liability would be applicable to all potatoes harvested after the date of enactment of the joint resolution, regardless of when they were planted. At any rate, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, either as he has stated it or as the Senator from Delaware would amend it, has the merit of providing for absolute termination of governmental liability for price support on the potatoes to which the amendment refers.

It seems to me, I say most respectfully, that under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, there is not such a complete cessation of governmental liability for price support as will be accomplished either by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as it has been submitted, or by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois as it would be amended by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

I think the matter is one of choice; I think it is for the Senate to determine whether it desires to terminate the liability and to know where the Government stands; or whether it will adopt an amendment under which, as I see it—inasmuch as any marketing order and agreement made in pursuance of the 1937 act would make the potatoes embraced within the order and agreement immediately subject to the obligation that price support shall be made available—we have a highly uncertain effect; we do not know how much, if any, the Government will save by the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont.

I wish to thank him and the other Senators for the assistance they have given me in responding to my questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

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. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michiga [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bricker	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Schoeppel
Cain	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Darby	Lehman	Taylor
Donnell	Lodge	Thye
Dworshak	Lucas	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	

NAYS—31

Chapman	Holland	Maybank
Chavez	Hunt	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Ellender	Kefauver	Russell
Fulbright	Kerr	Sparkman
George	Long	Stennis
Green	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McClellan	Withers
Hill	McFarland	
Hoey	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Douglas	Leahy	Tobey
Downey	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Flanders	Neely	Young

So Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. While the Williams amendment was pending, I sent to the desk an amendment to the same line in the same portion of the resolution, with the request that it be called up as soon as the vote was taken on the Williams amendment. I ask whether my amendment can now be considered, or would the Williams amendment eliminate consideration of my amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment which has just been adopted apparently does not affect the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. The Senator's amendment was sent up to lie on the table and to be called

up at his pleasure. The Chair has now recognized the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia was under the impression that he had asked the Chair to have his amendment considered as soon as the Williams amendment was voted on, and the Chair ruled the other amendment had to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only one amendment can be considered at a time. When an amendment is disposed of, any Senator who wants to offer another amendment, regardless of whether it has been sent to the desk to be printed and to lie on the table, is supposed to receive recognition to offer his amendment. The mere fact that the amendment had been sent up previously has no parliamentary effect. The Chair did not know the Senator from Virginia was seeking recognition.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia would like to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There has been printed an amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] relating to the cotton quota. As I understand, he is now asking to leave the potato section and to take up an amendment relating to cotton. I make the point of order that the Lucas amendment, as amended, is now the pending question, and that we cannot leave it to consider an amendment relating to cotton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no division as between the Lucas amendment and the committee amendment. It is all a part of the same amendment. Therefore the Chair is impelled to overrule the point of order.

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and without reducing any farm-acreage allotment determined pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, in the case of any State with an allotment for 1950 amounting to less than 3,000 acres, the allotment for such State shall be increased by an additional acreage of 2,000 acres to be used for establishing allotments for new farms in 1950. The additional acreage required to be allotted under this paragraph shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand my amendment is satisfactory to the Senators in charge of the joint resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday, during the debate, it developed that Nevada had an allotment of only 110 acres, and I suggested to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who had an amendment, that, speaking for myself, I would be willing to take the matter to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Virginia should be recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "the enactment of this joint resolution" and in lieu thereof to insert the words and figures "March 15, 1950."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the effect of my amendment is this: The potato amendment provides that there shall be no price supports for potatoes planted after this resolution shall become law. That might be March 6, March 8, March 10, or some other indefinite date. An amendment has been adopted which strikes out "planted" and inserts "harvested." So my amendment, if adopted, would strike out both the provision of the Lucas amendment and the language of the Williams amendment and provide support prices for potatoes planted prior to March 15 and not after that date. The purpose is to equalize the treatment of all who produce early potatoes. The Florida potatoes start to market in January. The marketing will be practically concluded by the 1st of April. In North Carolina some potatoes have been planted. A few have been planted in Tidewater Virginia, but on the Eastern Shore of Virginia none have been planted. By March 15, from the Atlantic Ocean to California potatoes will be planted, and the potatoes which will be harvested are thin-skin potatoes which will not keep. They will be covered by this provision. Otherwise, we will have a situation, even under the Williams amendment, in which potatoes from Florida, which have already been sold, will receive the benefit of the support prices.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I correctly understand the situation, the Senator from Virginia proposes to change the language of the amendment which has just been adopted. I would like to inquire whether that is in order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not affect the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, which was agreed to a while ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Virginia to say it did affect my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not affect it in a parliamentary sense.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. From every other point of view it would be affected, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a question which the Chair cannot pass on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia as it is written?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "the enactment of this joint resolution" and in lieu thereof to insert the words and figures "March 15, 1950."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment simply fixes a different date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Virginia that I think he is somewhat confused, because his amendment will not in any way affect Virginia potatoes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, then the amendment has not been properly drawn, because it was certainly my intention to affect Virginia potatoes. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Virginia that we have changed the word "planted" to "harvested," and since it is impossible to harvest the Virginia potatoes prior to March 15, therefore the Virginia potatoes could not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to amend my amendment. The situation is changed. [Laughter.] I wish to add to my amendment by striking out the word "harvested," and then perhaps it will do some good for Virginia, if we adopt it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would change the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware and agreed to by the Senate. That can only be reached by moving to reconsider the vote by which the Williams amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I respectfully bow to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia withdraw his amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I have to withdraw it, Mr. President, or could the Chair rule it out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator either has to withdraw it, or there will be a vote on it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment presented by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert 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 agreements and marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this amendment is identical with the one that

was printed and was on the desk, except that after the comma, following the word "law," the words "or marketing agreements" were added. Personally I do not think this addition makes any difference whatever in the amendment, but those words are inserted to satisfy anyone who might be in doubt. I am informed that it does not change the meaning of the amendment in any way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator offer this as a substitute for section 2?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment as I offered it is as I wanted it. I merely modify the one which was printed and was on the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is now offering an amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I am offering an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is, in effect, a substitute for section 2.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the action taken on the Williams Amendment, by which the word "planted" was changed to "harvested," would the Senator from Vermont consider changing his amendment in line 2 by striking out the word "planted" and substituting "harvested"? I do not suppose it makes much difference.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it will make much difference, except the Secretary has already advised those areas which are planted that they must come under marketing orders.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that there might be some question of interpretation. I think that if there is no objection, it would clarify the amendment, if the Senator would make the change.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont modify his amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it changes the effect of the amendment in any way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is an exceedingly important amendment. If it is agreed to by the Senate, the discussion we have had with respect to potatoes will be meaningless and futile.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield for the present.

Mr. LUCAS. I base the statement I have just made not alone upon my own interpretation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, the 1949 act, but also upon what the Secretary of Agriculture says this kind of an amendment means. I should like to remind the Senate that, irrespective of what the distinguished Senator from Vermont may say that the amendment means, irrespective of how he may construe the law, regardless of how he would like to have it administered, it so happens that the Secretary of Agriculture, the official who is to administer the potato law, and is doing so at the present time, has given his views of the effect of such an amendment. In view of the colloquy we had here yesterday with respect to this matter, I requested the Secretary of Agriculture to give me his opinion upon marketing agreements, and how this amendment would affect the amendment I have have offered for the purpose of clearing up what seems to me to be a rather scandalous situation. This is what the Secretary said about marketing agreements:

> Marketing agreements have certain very definite weaknesses and by no means are a cure-all for the potato-support problem. The first weakness is just the Government still has price-support obligations on all withheld grades of potatoes (except culls) which are produced by eligible growers. Therefore, if there is a surplus, marketing agreements in themselves do not assist in any way in reducing the amount of that surplus.

In other words, it is not only the potatoes which meet the requirements of the marketing orders so far as grade and size are concerned for commercial marketing, which are supported and purchased, but the potatoes which are now in the cellars of the farmers in Maine, Idaho, Michigan, Illinois, and all other States, unless they are culls, are also under the price-support program.

If this amendment is agreed to, the Secretary of Agriculture, so far as the 1950 crop is concerned—and he says so—will go on doing exactly what he is doing at the present time.

The Secretary says further in his statement:

> Although such agreements are beneficial to consumers, they do not directly benefit the Government insofar as reducing its obligations for any given amount of surplus.

Mr. President, that is the point. This amendment will not in anywise reduce the obligation of the Government insofar as surplus potatoes are concerned, and the surplus potatoes are the potatoes which are on the farms at the present time and cannot be disposed of.

The Secretary further says:

> Another thing that marketing agreements will not accomplish is any positive control of surplus production. At present, the only effective measure for attempting to control production is the voluntary acreage allotments. Reduction of potato production from its recent average of over 400,000,000 bushels down to a reasonable supply figure is the primary problem at present. Marketing agreements can be used to control the merchantable grades and sizes which are moving into commercial channels but cannot be used to reduce the total surplus itself since under existing legislation the Government is responsible for supporting the price on all commercial grades of potatoes whether or not they are sold in commercial channels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have read in the newspapers of, let us say, 160,000 bushels of potatoes being bought by the Government and then sold back to the farmer for 1 cent a bushel. If I heard the Senator's statement correctly, will there not be a great unfairness created between the man who now has his potatoes on the farm from his crop of last year, which he has not sold to the Government, and the man who has sold his to the Government and gotten his money at the support price?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I presume the Senator could offer a number of examples of cases in which there would be unfairness. As I said on the floor yesterday, we do not pass a law without injuring someone, somewhere. The question here does not concern the 1949 crop. I am attempting to do something about the 1950 crop.

Why it is, after the expenditure of all the money we have paid out in behalf of the potato growers of this country, that those who are primarily interested in potatoes still try to protect the potato growers in their efforts to get the very last dollar they can out of the potatoes, is a little more than I can understand.

As I said yesterday, the potato growers have taken from the Treasury of the United States half a billion dollars in subsidies. This is more than the producers of all the other basic and nonbasic crops put together have received. Surely it is time to call a halt, regardless of some injury here and some injury there.

Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture spent $224,000,000 on the 1948 crop of Irish potatoes. The allotment in 1949 for commercial potatoes was 1,200,000 acres. That would approximately be $187 per acre that the taxpayers of America have given to the potato growers for their surplus potatoes.

In 1949 there were harvested in the United States approximately 87,000,000 acres of corn, 77,000,000 acres of wheat, 27,000,000 acres of cotton, and one and a half million acres of tobacco. If the Federal Government had lost $187 per acre on merely these four major crops not counting the millions of acres of oats, barley, rye, sorghum, and so forth, the farm program in that one year alone would have cost approximately $36,000,000,000, which is in excess of the total gross farm income in 1949 from all sources, which was only $35,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I mention these figures to show what we have been doing for the potato farmer of America. Notwithstanding all the money which has been spent for the potato grower, we find Senators clamoring on the floor of the Senate, "Just give us another year of these subsidies. Do not do anything to us now."

Mr. President, I told my good friend, the Senator from Vermont, and also the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry told the Senate that

hearings would be held on the bill which I introduced, which is similar to the one the distinguished chairman of the committee introduced last year dealing with potato surpluses. When the Senator from Vermont was told that hearings would be held immediately upon that bill so that rigid controls could be applied to potatoes, as they are now applied to tobacco, corn, wheat, and cotton, the Senator from Vermont said he would look with sympathy upon that kind of legislation.

The potato farmers have had a greater bonanza than any other group of farmers in America, Mr. President. Adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont and the potato growers will continue doing exactly what they have been doing for the past 5 years.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Unholy and Unjustifiable," appearing in the February 18 issue of the Washington Star.

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

UNHOLY AND UNJUSTIFIABLE

No matter how one looks at it, the potato situation obviously adds up to a nonsensical fantasy rivaling anything to be found in Alice's topsy-turvy Wonderland. But though it has its comic side, there is no real fun in it for either the taxpaying American consumer, the Federal officials involved, or intelligent agriculturalists (including their representatives in Congress) who rightly regard it as a scandal that threatens to undermine the basically necessary over-all program for the support of farm prices.

In effect, stated with some oversimplification, the situation is one in which the grower earns a handsome Federal reward for doing precisely what the Government has been urging him not to do. In other words, he has an advance guaranty that if he overproduces potatoes—even when he knows there is no market for an excess—he will profit. There is no risk in it for him; he will still receive a good price for something that there is too much of already. The guaranty, of course, is fixed by law. Under that law, he can count on getting a certain minimum for his spuds. If he cannot get it from the consumer, then Washington will give it to him by buying up his surplus at a high figure (it has averaged $1.85 per 100 pounds) and then selling the whole business back to him for a penny per 100, on condition that he use it for fertilizer or livestock feed.

As far as the American consumer is concerned, this program may well be described as one that has added insult to injury. The injury is this: That he has been forced to pay a potato price so artificially high, and so much out of line with the economic law of supply and demand, that food brokers in many eastern cities (including this one) are now importing tubers from Canada at a cost considerably below that of shipments from Maine. As for the insult—an insult to the intelligence—it consists of the fact that the average citizen, besides being thus penalized in the market place, must fork over taxes to support the system that imposes the penalty. To date, according to Agriculture Secretary Brannan, the Government—which means the taxpaying public—has lost about a half billion dollars trying to make the thing work, but the results just seem to get crazier and crazier.

Indeed, the results have been so bad that Senate Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS has now been moved to describe the subsidies involved as being nothing less than "unholy and unjustifiable"—at least to the extent that they are granted without adequate controls over production. Under present law, the only control in operation provides for a limitation on acreage, but the growers have circumvented this, and doubled their output per acre, by an intensified use of fertilizers and by planting rows closers together. Accordingly, with the overwhelming backing of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. LUCAS is pressing for action to attach to the House-approved cotton bill a rider to deprive the 1950 crop of all price supports unless strict marketing quotas are in effect. Along with others, he is pressing also for additional checks to deal with the long-range problem of potato surpluses.

Certainly, the situation cries aloud for corrective action. Like our agricultural products in general, the lowly spud may have to have some form of continuing support. But the present system—which serves as an incentive to overproduction—is plainly too cockeyed to be tolerated much longer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not disposed to argue the merits of marketing agreements or marketing orders with the Senator from Illinois. Nowhere do I find that the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture endorse the proposition of the Senator from Illinois. I do understand that the Secretary states that the Department expects anyway to put into effect the provisions of the amendment which I am proposing now. But what the Senator from Illinois is proposing to do now is precipitantly to do away with the supports for all potatoes in all States where they have not yet been harvested. That means that only those potatoes already harvested in southern Florida and perhaps in southern Texas would be eligible for any support this year. With the adoption of the Williams amendment prohibiting support for any potatoes not yet harvested at the time of the approval of the joint resolution, we will have a situation under which we can either approve the amendment I propose, which will continue support for potatoes under certain restrictions of the Department of Agriculture, or we can accept the proposal made by the Senator from Illinois, and kill all potato support in States both North and South at this time. That is what the bill will accomplish if enacted as it now reads with the Williams amendment in it.

There may be some argument for killing all potato support at this time, even those already planted in South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana. There may be some argument for that, and we may come to doing it some time. But the situation now is that our Government has entered into an agreement with the potato growers of this country to support the price of potatoes at a reduced rate from that of last year, on a reduced acreage from that of last year, and with the requirement that marketing agreements and orders be observed—otherwise, the growers will not be entitled to any support whatsoever.

So the question now is: Shall we kill potato-support prices completely, or will we adopt my amendment?

Mr. President, on my amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in Virginia we raise two types of potatoes; those which are planted early in the spring and harvested in the summer, and those which are planted later and harvested in the fall. I offered an amendment to the Lucas amendment because I thought the Lucas amendment was unfair to those who would not have planted potatoes by the time the joint resolution became law.

In my opinion, the Williams amendment, against which I voted, made it still more unfair, because that, as the distinguished Senator from Vermont has just pointed out, would have taken care of the potato growers of Florida and of a part of Texas, but no other potato growers.

But now, Mr. President, we are faced with the situation of changing the rules in the midst of the game. Growers have either planted potatoes or they have bought the seed potatoes and the fertilizer, to plant them, on the assumption that they would have the same type of price support, which is not a great deal, but 60 percent of parity. Is that what it will be?

Mr. AIKEN. Sixty percent of parity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Sixty percent of parity. I offered my amendment with the view of covering potato growers clear across the continent who were in that peculiar situation. My amendment would at least take care of them. My amendment was not adopted. I listened quite attentively when the distinguished Senator from Vermont explained his amendment, and he predicted that if its provisions were properly administered—of course, I cannot guarantee that they will be—that there would be no appreciable surplus of potatoes.

Then the distinguished Senator from Illinois read a statement, I believe prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture, saying that if we should adopt the Aiken amendment we would leave everything in status quo, we would have no big surplus and no big loss to the taxpayers.

Mr. President, earlier today, fearing that not a sufficient number of my colleagues would see my viewpoint respecting my amendment, and that we might have to reach the situation by some other approach, I discussed the problem with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I should like to propound a question to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, who I am happy to see is on the floor. What was the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the potato expert from the Department of Agriculture on a proposal such as we are now about to vote upon? I should like to have the Senator from North Carolina answer that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from North Carolina may answer the question.

Mr. HOEY. The representatives from the Department of Agriculture stated

that they were now putting into effect the same thing that is recommended and included in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. They indicated that they thought they would be able to control the situation so that there would not be the sort of surplus which has accrued heretofore, and the same kind of loss previously entailed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture came before the committee and said that without any action on the part of the Congress, they were going to do what the Senator from Vermont says should be done by the amendment he proposes to place in the law, otherwise we will not have any price support at all. Is that correct?

Mr. HOEY. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont makes mandatory what the agricultural commissioner says they are doing already.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, do I understand that my distinguished colleague from North Carolina believes, from his long and wide knowledge of farm matters, and from serving on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the Aiken amendment will safeguard the taxpayers as well as do justice to the farmers?

Mr. HOEY. I am supporting the Aiken amendment. I supported it in the committee. I did not think it was fair in the middle of a planting season to repudiate the contract which the Government has made with the potato grower, any more than I would thing that the Government ought to repudiate any other contract it makes with any of its citizens.

I believe in the integrity of the Government, in the maintenance of its contracts, even though it may occasion some loss of money. I believe that by proper administration by the Department of Agriculture a vast amount can be saved. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would tend to a great deal of confusion. I do not believe that another bill could be passed quickly enough to remedy that situation.

I am extremely anxious that the Government shall save money on the potato program. I believe that as a result of the discussions which have been held on the floor of the Senate, which indicate the sentiments of the Senate, the Department of Agriculture will go forward with this program in an earnest effort to reduce the losses. Furthermore, I believe that disposition can be made of the potatoes in such a manner as not to cause resentment on the part of the public, which has been aroused by reason of failure to use the surplus potatoes for proper purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Aiken amendment. I do not feel that I should add anything to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for himself and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], as modified, to the committee amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	Robertson
Cain	Hoey	Schoeppel
Capehart	Holland	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Hunt	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Darby	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Taylor
Eastland	Lehman	Thye
Ecton	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	
Gurney	Morse	

NAYS—35

Benton	Johnson, Tex.	McMahon
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Connally	Kefauver	Myers
Donnell	Kem	O'Conor
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
Frear	Kilgore	Saltonstall
George	Leahy	Taft
Gillette	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Long	Tobey
Hayden	Lucas	Tydings
Humphrey	McFarland	Williams
Jenner	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Douglas	Magnuson	Withers
Downey	Neely	Young

So Mr. AIKEN's amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Aiken amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was just agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer the amendment lettered "D", which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to add the following new section:

That whenever the supply of Irish potatoes in the United States is, or is practically certain to be, in excess of the goal of production or national production allotment set by the Secretary of Agriculture, pursuant to section 401, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the President shall proclaim that fact, and thereafter, until such time as the President may determine and proclaim that such a surplus no longer exists, no Irish potatoes or products thereof shall be imported into the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have had two amendments printed and have requested that they lie on the table.

This one is lettered "D." It leaves out the quotas or the marketing agreements. I shall explain that point later.

The amendment is very simple and to the point. It would prohibit the importation of potatoes when we have or when it appears certain that we shall have a surplus of our own. The logic behind it is that when we have a surplus, we shall concentrate on the disposal of it, and not absorb or dispose of the surpluses of other countries.

The amendment is not the answer to the entire problem of potato surpluses in the United States, of course; but it would remove one very aggravating feature, namely, that of greatly increased surpluses because of the importation of large quantities of the very commodity of which we have too much. At least we can ease the situation to that extent.

Section 22 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which I think incorporates a vicious principle which should never have been enacted into law, and should be repealed, provides—and I quote now from page 3, subsection (f), under section 22:

> No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.

Mr. President, my amendment, however, in no way runs contrary to that section, which is still the law of the land. The amendment I offer to the committee amendment is not in contravention of any foreign-trade agreement; it does not contravene any of the reciprocal-trade agreements. As a matter of fact, the general agreement made at Geneva, to which Canada, the United States, and some 25 other nations adhere, specifically provides for the very action I am now asking to have taken when surpluses of an agricultural product or a fisheries product occur. The countries foresaw the possible need for the very thing the amendment seeks to accomplish.

Mr. President, the amendment is urgently needed. Certainly it is an unwise policy for us to permit imports of commodities of which we already have surpluses. That cannot be brought home I think any better than by quoting a colloquy between the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from New Mexico, on February 16, at the time the distinguished majority leader introduced the so-called quota amendment to the joint resolution which is now pending.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Would it not be wise for the Senator to add to the statement about importing a product into this country of which there is a surplus, the words "a surplus, the price of which the Government has guaranteed"?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it would suit me very well, but, to draw an amendment which does not run counter to the law to which I have referred requires that it be drawn as I have drawn it, and I shall explain it later. I was one who voted with the distinguished Senator from Washington to eliminate section 22.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator's amendment is, of course, similar to the over-all amendment I proposed last year to the agricultural bill, except that it applies directly to potatoes.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President, the Senator is misled. The amendment is not similar to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to make the observation. If it is not similar, it is all right.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree, however, with the amendment the Senator offered, but the Senator's amendment ran immediately into guaranties made and agreements entered into under the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade. I may point out to the Senate that there is a provision also which permits the amendment I am here offering to be made without interfering in any way whatever with the agreement. It is different from the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington; with which I am in complete agreement, by the way. I would support it again, if the Senator were to reoffer it on the floor. But I am satisfied the amendment represents the practical way of reaching the objective, as I shall show when I get to that point in my argument. It does not interfere with trade agreements.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to make the observation that I have intended to reoffer the proposal. I had thought possibly I might offer it as an amendment to the pending joint resolution, since it involves the same problem, but, upon considering the question further, it seemed to me it would be much more in point to offer it in the manner suggested by the Senator from West Virginia, in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington can offer it at that time, and, of course, the same arguments will then be made against it that no doubt were made before. But I want to make clear at this point that my amendment relates only to potatoes. While it is only a small part of the over-all objective of the Senator from Washington, yet it can be adopted without running head-on into the very trouble the Senator encountered when he offered his amendment last year, which I supported.

I should like to refer to the colloquy between the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from New Mexico, for the reason that the junior Senator from New Mexico has been the Secretary of Agriculture and has, therefore, had wide experience in the question of meeting the problems of surplus. At the time the distinguished majority leader was making his able address in favor of his own amendment, I asked the majority leader a question, which was, in part, as follows:

> I am also interested in another phase of the question which the distinguished majority leader did not mention in his remarks. I am asking for information. Recently I read in a newspaper the statement that in the city of New Orleans a million pounds of potatoes which were imported from Canada were being sold in that market, and of course they received the benefit of the support price.
>
> At the same time the Government is selling potatoes for 1 cent a hundred pounds in order to get rid of the surplus. I should like to ask this question: Has there been any extension of the agreement which was once made between our State Department and Canada and other nations which import potatoes relative to the quotas which the distinguished majority leader has mentioned? It is my understanding that there have been imported into the domestic market from other countries millions of pounds of potatoes which have had the benefit of the support price, and, if I am correctly informed, the Canadian farmers last year increased their acreage 10 percent while our farmers decreased their acreage 10 percent. Does the Senator have anything in mind along that line relative to restrictive legislation?

The honorable majority leader replied:

> That question was not discussed in the committee. It is of importance, of course. It is my understanding that the potatoes which have gone into the market at New Orleans were shipped by water from Canada.
>
> Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. At the same time they were sold in direct competition with the American producer who was operating under the support price.
>
> Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, no doubt, but it has nothing to do with the problem which is before us. The problem that we are concerned with here would exist whether there were potato imports or not.

At that point the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] rose in the Senate Chamber, addressed the Chair, and requested the majority leader to yield. The majority leader yielded, and the junior Senator from New Mexico said:

> I discussed this matter briefly with the distinguished minority leader a minute ago when he asked me the same question. I could not give him a very satisfactory answer. That particular matter came up at a hearing and was brought to the attention of the committee by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. There was an agreement between Canada and the United States limiting the quantity of potatoes which could be delivered to this country.
>
> I regret to say that I do not recall when the agreement terminated, but it was some time during the year 1949. The Senator from Maine asked who had allowed it to lapse, and, so far as I know, the question was not answered, and I do not know who allowed it to lapse. I do think it is an important question and ultimately should be answered.
>
> Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico a question. Does he know whether the Secretary of Agriculture, or possibly the Secretary of State, has the authority or used the authority to terminate the agreements about which he is talking?
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. I regret to say that I do not know. What I do know is that the Canadian Government has certain rights to export to the United States at a certain lower rate of duty potatoes which would ordinarily carry a higher rate of duty. Theoret-

ically they could export a good many potatoes to this country, but the Department of State, working with the Department of Agriculture, negotiated an agreement with Canada whereby Canada would not export, in either 1948 and 1949, more than a certain number of potatoes. I understand that agreement has been terminated. I do not know whether it was terminated by its own limitations, or whether it was terminated at the request of the Canadian Government, or was terminated at the request of our Government. I merely say to the distinguished minority leader that that was a question the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] raised, and which was not answered. I think it is an important question to be answered, but I do not have the information, and I do not think any member of the Committee on Agriculture was furnished the information.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the answer he has given me. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may propound that question, in discussing and considering proposed legislation.

I should like to ask another question of the Senator from New Mexico. Realizing that the distinguished Senator has been Secretary of Agriculture, and has had wide experience, does he feel that the importation of potatoes from other countries has had an impact upon the domestic market, or does he feel that such importation is a minor question at this time?

There has been much talk around the Senate, Mr. President, to the effect that the slight imports coming in make no difference. About the first thing that is asked Mr. Hoffman, when he comes before the Appropriations Committee to testify, is a question about surpluses. The answer is, "Well, they are so small in comparison to our production that they make no difference, anyway." There were editorials in the newspapers saying, "We had a production this year of about 400,000,000 bushels, so what does 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 bushels amount to, as far as a surplus is concerned?" When it is analyzed, it makes a great deal of difference. It was for that reason that I asked the question of the former Secretary of Agriculture, I now want to read his answer relative to what he calls "these small surpluses that affect the market." So far as potatoes are concerned, potatoes are only one item. We have thousands and thousands of other commodities and materials being imported, with like effect and with similar impact upon the economy of the United States of America. Potatoes represent but one commodity; scores of other commodities raise the same question. I read now the answer of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico:

I think it has a very great impact on the American market. I am not an economist, as the Senator knows, but distinguished economists who have been consulted by the Department of Agriculture have worked out estimates as to what happens when there is a surplus. If there is a surplus of 5 percent—

Mind you, Mr. President, "a surplus of 5 percent." In 1949 the goal of production was 350,000,000 bushels of potatoes. That is the amount the Department of Agriculture really thought would be consumed in the domestic market. The domestic market did not consume quite that many potatoes, I am now told, but something like 350,000,000 was what was estimated to be consumed. It is also stated by the Department of Agriculture that the amount of potatoes produced in this country last year was 402,000,000 bushels. So that leaves a difference of 52,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes thrown on the markets of the United States. I shall give statistics later to show that the amount of potatoes shipped to this country last year was in the neighborhood of 9,000,000 bushels, and this year, at the rate at which they are being imported, the amount may reach 15,000,000 bushels. So, if we take the importation of 15,000,000 bushels and the surplus of 50,000,000 or even 60,000,000 bushels, there are being imported to this country an amount which is practically one-fourth of the surplus which is causing us difficulty at this time.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator recall that while we were reducing our production by 10 percent, at the request of the Agricultural Department, and the citizens of Maine were reducing their production by 10 percent, the Province of New Brunswick, Canada, increased its production by 10 percent?

Mr. WHERRY. I am aware of that fact, but I thank the Senator for his observation.

The point I wish to stress is this:

But distinguished economists who have been consulted by the Department of Agriculture have worked out estimates as to what happens when there is a surplus. If there is a surplus of 5 percent, it does not result in the price dropping 5 percent; ordinarily it may drop 10 percent, or if there is a surplus of 10 or 20 percent, it might result in a drop of 50 percent.

Five percent would be 3,000,000 bushels; 10 percent would be 6,000,000 bushels.

That is an illustration of the effect that is created upon the domestic market of the United States by these importations. So, when Washington newspapers say, "What is the difference?", they have apparently not given to the subject the analysis which is being given by the economists of the Nation, that it is the percentage of potatoes coming into this country against the surplus we have which results in such a great impact upon our domestic economy.

Mr. President, I continue with the answer of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]:

Every time there are a few more bushels, it disturbs a market which is already in trouble. When there was demand for the product in this country slight importations were insignificant, but when, as this year, there is a surplus of potatoes, any aggravation of it is many times more effective than in ordinary periods.

Mr. President, I am taking some time to bring the point to the attention of the Senate because what is true of potatoes is true as to scores of other commodities, the impact of which is causing difficulty in the American market. They may not be so dramatic as potatoes, because they have not received so much publicity.

I mentioned Mr. Hoffman, who contends that these slight importations have no effect. In a statement in the press attributed to Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, he said that the administration's drive to increase imports from Europe to balance international trade would create unemployment in a few localities, necessitating special unemployment programs.

He anticipated special unemployment programs because of the dislocations which he says will actually happen.

I read from the newspaper article:

But he insisted, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the extent of unemployment resulting from competition from imports was greatly exaggerated. Compared to total American production, he said, these imports would be a mere drop in the bucket, with negligible effect on the whole economy.

That is the point I want to illustrate. There are produced 400,000,000 bushels of potatoes and about 15,000,000 bushels will be imported this year, but that does not reveal the full story of the impact caused by the importation. It is responsible for a quarter, if not for a third of the surplus.

Mr. Hoffman goes on and says that what we should do is to lengthen the period of unemployment insurance, institute job-training programs to teach workers other skills, and management-training programs aimed at getting businesses blocked by foreign competition to turn to new products, so as to permit the importation of products into this country.

That is his answer to the questions asked about the dislocations caused by importations of similar commodities.

Mr. President, I think it is an unwise policy to continue to permit imports into this country of commodities of which there is a domestic surplus.

The United States owns enough linseed oil so that we would not need to produce any for more than a year. That is the situation, also, with reference to eggs. All Senators have heard about that situation. They are scattered all over the United States. The situation is known in every section of the country.

A number of other agricultural products are in surplus. How could it be otherwise at this particular time, when the huge output under pressure to feed the whole world has caught up to and exceeded the demand? It will take a little time to adjust our domestic output, as the rest of the world is rapidly catching up with and exceeding the prewar production.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that 2 years ago when the junior Senator from Nebraska pleaded against controls and asked the Senate to take them off, and not to impose price ceilings, he was criticized severely from one end of the land to the other. I said at that time, "If you remove the controls and give the producers an opportunity to produce, they will produce all the food that is necessary, and the prices will be so low that you will be asked for relief from surpluses rather than from price ceilings."

That was true of meat. Steers in the feed-lots are selling for half the price at which they sold 2 years ago. The same is true of hogs. They have to be mighty fine hogs to bring $15 a hundred pounds. As to eggs, the bottom has fallen out of the market. A good fat hen will not

bring enough to pay the freight to ship her to market.

The restrictions under this resolution are the most strict that have ever been imposed. A potato farmer might go to the other extreme and, within 6 months or a year, say, "Why in the world did you hold down production? Why not let it operate in normal channels?" If the Aiken bill had been in effect, as the Senator has already stated, two-thirds of the difficulty would have been eliminated.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is very likely that there would not have been any surplus if the Secretary had appointed an advisory committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. We are dealing with the economy of the country. I do not want to make any exaggerated statement. The potato situation is bad, and I am offering an amendment which I think will help to correct the situation. The importations of potatoes should be stopped, because they are adding to the surplus we already have. What is true of potatoes is true of many commodities which are coming into this country.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator will be interested to know that two shiploads of potatoes from Canada are now on the way to Florida. The cargo amounts to 50,000 bushels. On their admission the Government will simply have to buy 50,000 bushels of Florida or other potatoes to make up for the quantity in that shipment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Maine for his observation. It is very much in point. On the same market there will be potatoes sold at 1 cent a hundred pounds, the price of which we are supporting for no good reason.

The people of the United States, however, stirred up by the Government order to destroy millions of bushels of potatoes, and by the constant importation of huge quantities which force the destruction of even more of our own, are demanding that something be done.

Potatoes are perishable. Storage for any length of time is impossible. They are grown in every State of the Union, mostly, in fact, almost entirely, by small, individually owned farm units. It is not sound economics nor is it fair to all these millions of farm families to saddle them with the burden of foreign surpluses on top of our own.

I repeat, these very surpluses are largely a result of expanded planting and improvement of yields when much of the world was starving and needed all the food the United States could produce. Now we are retrenching at home. Can there be any objection from any source against some kind of similar retrenchment concerning imports, especially where there are no acreage limitations or where, in many instances, the acreage limitations have increased by leaps and bounds?

I want to invite the attention of the Senate to some statistics.

Our production goal for potatoes in 1945 was 408,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 418,000,000 bushels.

In 1946 our goal was 377,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 484,000,000 bushels.

In 1947 our goal was 375,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 389,048,000 bushels.

In 1948 the goal was 375,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 445,850,000 bushels.

In 1949 the goal was 350,000,000 bushels. We actually produced 401,962,000 bushels.

In 1950 the goal will be 335,000,000 bushels. With the Aiken amendment and with the pending amendment, it is my opinion that there will be no surplus. In fact, if we have adverse weather conditions we may wonder why we placed these strict quotas on the farmers who are producing potatoes.

Let us see what the imports were. In 1938, they were 764,000 bushels, with a value of $581,000. In 1939, 1,564,000 bushels, with a value of $1,527,000. In 1940, 1,324,000 bushels, with a value of $1,272,000. In 1941, 1,267,000 bushels, with a value of $670,000.

As I did with the other figures, I now skip the war years and go to 1946. In 1946, the importations were 2,260,000 bushels, with a value of $3,279,000. In 1947, 5,258,000 bushels, with a value of $7,454,000. In 1948, 6,176,000 bushels, with a value of $9,130,000. In 1949, 9,574,000 bushels, with a value of $12,920,000.

If the estimates which the Department of Agriculture gave me hold good for the remainder of the year, the maximum amount of importations—they tell me, but they are not sure about it—according to their conservative estimates, will be 15,000,000 bushels, with a value of $19,000,000. That shows how potato importations are growing. Yet with the growing importations, we are placing restrictions on our own potato growers.

Use of potatoes in the United States varies, but it is estimated we are going to use in the United States around 335,000,000 bushels, so that the difference between the production goal and the actual production is what gives the surplus, and that is what we must watch out for.

So that taking the goal next year and the production this year, there is a surplus of about 65,000,000 to 70,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

And if we import 15,000,000 bushels into this country this year, that does have a decisive effect upon price of potatoes in the open market.

CLASSES OF IMPORTS; CERTIFIED SEED AND OTHER

There are two classes of imports—certified seed and other.

The latter is generally designated as table stock, although it may include small quantities used in the making of starch, flour, or similar products. In the act of 1930, all potatoes were dutiable at 75 cents a hundred pounds. The present rate of duty is a little complicated.

Imports of seed: The first 2,500,000 bushels imported in any crop year, beginning on September 15 of each year, are dutiable at 37½ cents a hundred. Imports above the 2,500,000 bushels are dutiable at 75 cents a hundred.

Imports of other potatoes: The first million bushels imported in any crop year are dutiable at 37½ cents a hundred; imports above that amount are dutiable at 75 cents a hundred; provided, that if production in the United States, as estimated on September 1 of each year by the Department of Agriculture, falls below 350,000,000 bushels as many more table potatoes may enter at the 37½-cent rate as the production estimate is under the 350,000,000 bushels.

In other words, every time our production drops 1,000,000 bushels below 350,000,000 bushels, the importing countries can add a million bushels at the duty of 37½ cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will not the Senator call attention to the fact that our goal for this year is 350,000,000 bushels?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that if we were successful, and if everybody cooperated, and we were to produce only 335,000,000 bushels, Canada would be able to send to the United States 15,000,000 additional bushels at a duty of 37½ cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point which I was about to make. I thank the Senator for making the observation. According to the schedule I have, if we reach the goal of 335,000,000 bushels, under the general trade agreements—and there are 23 of them—foreign countries can ship into our country 15,000,000 bushels additional at a duty of 37½ cents a hundred pounds.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator has partly answered my question. His statement is based on our having reciprocal trade agreements with Canada and other potato-producing countries. Am I correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The general agreement is implemented by the schedule I have, which arrives at the figure of 350,000,000 bushels. That is covered in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. WATKINS. If we produce under that figure, the foreign countries may increase their imports.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. There is no limit to the quantity of potatoes that may enter the United States at the 75-cent rate of duty. It is unlimited, at 75 cents duty.

SEPARATE AGREEMENT WITH CANADA TO LIMIT SHIPMENTS OF POTATOES TO THE UNITED STATES

The substantial surplus of potatoes resulting from a bumper crop in 1948 caused considerable pressure on the administration to limit imports.

The President, with the Secretary of Agriculture, had authority to apply a quota or otherwise clamp down on the importation of foreign-grown potatoes, but he chose the alternative of making a separate arrangement with Canada. That is the agreement referred to by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. AN-

DERSON]. It has nothing to do with the reciprocal trade agreements, however.

An exchange of notes resulted in the mutual signing of a document in which Canada agreed to try to limit the shipments of potatoes to the United States to those marked "Certified seed" until the end of the current crop year. I cite Public Document No. 3474, Joint Agriculture and State Department Release No. 954, November 26, 1948.

In return for a bona fide effort on the part of Canada to send only seed, and to send it to the usual seed markets, and only during the usual shipping season, the United States promised not to assess quotas or other limitations on imports during the 1948–49 season. That agreement was not renewed. I speak with authority when I say that there has been an attempt to renew it, but, of course, Canada does not want to renew that agreement when under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act they get the benefits from importations which they are now enjoying.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. That agreement, I think it is fair to assume, is clearly the result of the power in the hands of the President to set quotas or to stop importations. Does the Senator know why, in view of the surplus this year, with which the authorities have been familiar for the past 6 months, no steps have been taken by the President or the Secretary of Agriculture, so far as we know, to institute restrictions on Canadian importations?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the $64 question. There is no reason given for it. I am told that strenuous efforts are being made to renew the agreement, rather than use the power of the President to do the very thing the Senator has suggested. Why it has not been done, I cannot tell.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Secretary of Agriculture was asked about that, and he said before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that he had no information as to any attempts to renew the agreement this year, and he did not know whether it had lapsed or had been denounced. Is it possible there was anyone interested in increasing the apparent surplus of American potatoes in order to dump them at a critical moment and persuade the American people that a change was desirable?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer is that someone must have been interested in doing it, because at this moment the surpluses are much larger than they were when the agreement was made a year ago, so if it is necessary, and the President had the power then, he certainly has the power now, and the Secretary of Agriculture has been negligent in failing to exercise his power to stop importations of potatoes, which have had such a disastrous effect on the potato market, and which are causing us to make undue payments at the expense of the taxpayers which otherwise would not be made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would it not be well for those who are so interested in the matter to urge the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to take the steps which would in the next 3 months save the American Treasury $20,000,000, beyond peradventure?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly think so. That is the conclusion I was about to announce. I think that if the amendment shall be agreed to, it will become mandatory that the administration do something about importations of potatoes.

Mr. President, I should be glad indeed to answer any questions. If there are no questions, I should like to have action on the amendment as quickly as possible.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate very long, because I am as anxious to see action completed on the bill as is any other Senator. I was going to say that I frankly admit that I did not know until today the volume of the importations of potatoes from Canada. This afternoon I have ascertained that the average over a period of years has been about 1,000,000 bushels, and that for 1948 it had reached 9,500,000 bushels. I believe the Senator from Nebraska said that when it did that, stimulated by our support program, giving a market that was artificially supported, and so very profitable that potatoes could be brought into the United States over the tariff barriers, the President acted under section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 to reach a gentleman's agreement or some kind of agreement limiting the amount that could come in. I think that the amount heretofore estimated to come in in 1950 is probably excessive, because I have been informed this afternoon, and, I believe, officially so, that the outside estimate is now 13,000,000 bushels. But in any event I want to say that this unconsumable surplus on our hands is too much.

I for one will certainly bring to the attention of the White House my remarks made on the floor today respecting the power which the President has under the Agricultural Act of 1948, to reach some agreement not to permit Canada to take advantage of our agricultural program, which has not been well handled, we will admit, but which was designed in good faith to help our farmers and our potato growers, and which has thereby created a market which was never intended when our reciprocal trade agreement with Canada was negotiated and the tariff was fixed under it respecting competitive Canadian potatoes.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield briefly because I do not want to hold the floor long.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the able Senator from Virginia a question. The President does have, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the power to regulate or fix the number of bushels of potatoes, or the volume of potatoes, which may come into the United States. He does have that power now, does he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is an escape clause in all the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. THYE. That clause can be put into effect when what we call the peril point is reached?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. Moreover, the President can act under section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which provides:

> Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program of price supports or production controls, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, with due notice to interested parties, with an opportunity for hearing.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Then I should say to the able Senator from Virginia that there is now legislation on the statute books, there is now authority reposed in the Secretary of Agriculture to declare that potatoes are surplus, and when he so declares, the President, or the State Department, can regulate the importation of any commodity or any product or produce. For that reason, while the legislation proposed by the able Senator from Nebraska would specifically deal with the question, yet the President has the authority and the power under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to close out or shut off any importation of potatoes when there is danger of a surplus.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether the amendment would not in effect make mandatory a statutory declaration of a peril point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, the amendment would do more than apply a peril point. It would cut off all importation of potatoes. It would smack our best friend in the face. Senators speak of $9,000,000 worth of potatoes coming in from Canada. For every dollar of potato importations from Canada, Canada buys three or four dollars' worth of fresh fruits and vegetables from us. By smacking our best friend in the face in the manner proposed by the amendment we would cut off the market in Canada for Florida oranges and grapefruit, for Texas oranges and grapefruit, for California fresh fruits and dried fruits. Over and above that, Canada is the best customer we have in the world. Senators talk about $9,000,000 worth of potatoes. Canada buys $500,000,000 worth of goods from us, and she pays for them. It is not a give-away proposition under the Marshall plan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not the adoption of the amendment mean the application of the statutory peril-point provision?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will say that it is worse than the peril point, because in

that event at least the Tariff Commission could make investigation and recommendation, on which the President could act. The amendment would shut off all importations of potatoes from Canada immediately. I think that would be a most ill-advised thing to do. We would be acting as though Russia did not have the atomic bomb. We would be smacking our best customer in the face over some potatoes, when we have a law under which we can handle the situation.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment only provides that the authority which the President now has shall be made mandatory. That is all it provides. It would apply only at a time when there is a surplus, and the surplus will be determined on the basis of the allocations and the national allotments made by the Secretary of Agriculture. The occasion may never arise to put this provision into force, but if the occasion should arise, it then would become mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to do exactly what the law now provides he shall do. It does not change the law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Nebraska has presented two amendments which are printed. I do not know which of the two he is now offering. The amendment I have in my hand says "if a surplus exists." Everyone knows a surplus does exist. The other says "if a quota is imposed." Perhaps the Senator is going to offer that amendment also. I say, Mr. President, that in my honest opinion, if the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is adopted, it will immediately shut off all importation of potatoes from Canada.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It will do so only when there is a surplus. That language is taken out of the agricultural act. The Senator goes as far afield as can be when he says that adoption of my amendment would shut off all business from Canada. The amendment provides only that when allocations are set and national allotments provided, if there are surplus potatoes the provisions of the amendment become effective. It applies not only to Canada, but to 23 other countries. They shall not continue to ship potatoes into the United States so long as the condition of surplus exists.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the Senator from Nebraska trying to get the Senator from Virginia to say that he never reads the newspapers, that he has never heard of any surplus of potatoes in the United States, that he has not heard that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked Congress, "What shall I do with 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes? If you do not tell me what to do with them, I will sell them for 1 cent a bag, or destroy them." I know there is a surplus. Everyone in the country knows there is a surplus, and the Senator from Nebraska knows that everyone in the country knows there is a surplus. Does the Senator think Canada does not know what the effect of his amendment would be? Does he believe that Canada does not know that adoption of the amendment would stop the importation of all potatoes into the United States from Canada?

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Virginia that if the amendment is adopted, and if an order is issued prohibiting the importation of more potatoes from Canada, that will immediately be followed by Canada placing a restriction against imports of some of our own agricultural products, and the net result will be to injure the American farmer and not help him a single bit.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There can be no doubt about that. But the situation is that the Canadian Government is not shipping potatoes into the United States. The potatoes are shipped here by the Canadian farmer, who finds a good market here and takes advantage of it. No one can blame the Canadian farmer for doing that. But if the amendment is adopted by congressional action, the Canadian Government immediately comes into the picture. By adopting the amendment we will have struck at the Government of Canada. Adoption of the amendment would mean that we have, in my opinion, violated our treaties with that Government. The shutting off of imports of potatoes from Canada by the proposed action would, in my opinion, mean the violation of a trade agreement with Canada under which we agreed to take potatoes of a certain type, but we did not place the quota. Since then we have adopted an escape clause. We now have section 22 of the act of 1948.

I for one shall certainly communicate with the White House, because when we are paying our taxpayers' money to support the potato price, I do not condone any action which will permit Canada to step up her normal export of potatoes to us from 1,000,000 bushels to 13,000,000 bushels. Everyone knows that the importation of potatoes from Canada has been stepped up, because the support price has made ours an attractive market. But let us not ask the Congress to go on record as now proposed, by the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, and thus smack in the face the best friend we have in the world.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I resent those words, and I have the right to speak, because I submitted the amendment. I am not smacking anyone in the face. I am asking that there be done exactly what the President of the United States did last year. Last year he did exactly what we are now proposing to ask him to do this year. But he has refused to act. So far as that is concerned, our business with Canada has been fine, and will continue to be fine, whether my amendment is adopted or not. All we ask the President of the United States to do is exactly what is provided in the legislation now on the books. He took action a year ago. The President refuses to take such action now, as was so ably pointed out by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who would like to know why such action is not being taken now.

The idea is that we are asking that something be done in a mandatory way which is similar to that which was done a year ago. If the Senator from Virginia had been on the floor when I offered the amendment he would have known which amendment I offered.

I think I gave the Senate a very fair presentation of it. I said that not only is Canada shipping potatoes into the United States, but is shipping potatoes into our territories. All in the world the amendment does is to provide that there shall be no further importation so long as there is a surplus of this commodity in the United States. That surplus is defined by the allocation and the national allotments fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture himself .

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that he did not see me on the floor for the same reason that I could not hear him. I was sitting behind him, and I do not hear so well when I am behind the speaker as I do when I am in front of him. Neither does the Senator see so well those who are behind him.

I will read one of the amendments offered by the Senator from Nebraska, which I assume to be the one on which he now asks action:

> That whenever the supply of Irish potatoes in the United States is, or is practically certain to be, in excess of the goal of production or national production allotment set by the Secretary of Agriculture—

That is one situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Pursuant to section 401 of the present law. That is the amendment I am offering.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

> Pursuant to section 401, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the President shall proclaim that fact.

Everyone knows that at this time we have an excess of potatoes. Everyone knows that while the amendment would ask the President to proclaim it, he has now no option but to proclaim it. Everyone knows it will be congressional action, through the President, immediately cutting off any imports of potatoes from Canada. We may call it hostile action or ill-advised action, or we may call it, as the Canadians would call it, I believe, a slap in the face. I do not think Canada would regard it in any other way. The Canadians might not say officially or over the radio or in talking to the President, "You have slapped us in the face," but at the same time it seems to me the language here proposed would mean just that.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that in the past we have enacted legislation of this nature, doing the same thing with respect to cotton?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have had in the Agricultural Adjustment Act an escape clause to protect our cotton growers from the importation of cotton, and then we would put on a quota.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We had a gentlemen's agreement affecting cotton piece cloth from Japan, at one time.

Mr. President, I see no objection in the world to asking the President to do what we would like to authorize him to do; but I contend that is not what this amendment would do. I contend that this amendment immediately would cut off, by congressional action, the importation of potatoes. I think that would be unwise and shortsighted, and would be calculated to invite retaliation or reprisals.

For years Canada has purchased far more from us than we have purchased from Canada. Canada has been buying our fresh fruits and vegetables and other commodities, and has bought far more from us than we have bought from her.

Mr. President, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Virginia familiar with the provisions of the Canadian trade agreement, which I hold in my hand, which expressly contemplates the very situation we now face? I read now from page 23, article XI, section 2, in which the very action we have just referred to is contemplated. The provisions of section 2 are, in part, as follows:

The provisions of paragraph 1 of this article—

Which provides about not imposing quotas or restrictions—

shall not extend to the following:

* * * * *

(b) Import and export prohibitions or restrictions necessary to the application of standards or regulations for the classification, grading, or marketing of commodities in international trade;

(c) Import restrictions on any agricultural or fisheries product, imported in any form, necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate—

(i) to restrict the quantities of the like domestic product permitted to be marketed or produced, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted; or (ii)—

This comes directly to the matter now under our consideration—

to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product.

Mr. President, could there be a better description of the product here involved?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think so; I think that is a perfect description. I have not challenged that under the reciprocal trade agreement we have the power to act or that under the Agricultural Act of 1948 the President has the power to act. I have said that I did not know until now that this many potatoes have come in. I did not know the President had the right to act.

Mr. BREWSTER. He had the power to act, and has had it for 6 months, but he has not acted. He has taken that position when conditions have been building up to the tragic situation of today, which has led the Senator from Illinois to demand that all supports be wiped out. Despite that, they have calmly admitted 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes, which is one-third of the surplus we are arguing about; and neither the President nor the Secretary of Agriculture has lifted a hand to stop the importation of those potatoes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall not yield further.

I have tried to make it clear that I wish to go along with the efforts to reach the goal the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has in mind, but I cannot endorse the method by which he is proposing to reach it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is apparent that it will take some time to reach a vote upon this amendment alone, because other Members of the Senate desire to speak upon it. It is practically a part of the reciprocal trade agreements.

In view of the fact that there are other amendments to be voted upon, I wonder whether we can obtain unanimous consent to vote on Monday, at either 2 or 3 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the distinguished majority leader would propose that the vote be taken at 3 o'clock. I myself would not object to having the vote taken at 2 o'clock, but I think 3 o'clock probably would be generally satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS. When I stated earlier today that we would have a night session, a number of Senators immediately came to me and said they had dinner engagements. Of course, I do not like to disappoint them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the proposal is that we shall vote at 3 o'clock on Monday—on what, please?

Mr. LUCAS. On everything—all the amendments to the joint resolution and on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire who would have charge of the time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WHERRY. I asked that question because the wheat amendment is still to be discussed, is it not? I do not know how much time will be required for that purpose.

I might inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether 3 o'clock would be satisfactory, in view of the fact that the wheat amendment has not yet been reached.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has an amendment. My colleague from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I have an amendment

This is a rather talkative subject, of course.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] also has an amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has been disposed of.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder whether it would be better to provide for the voting to begin at 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have an amendment. I am perfectly willing to offer it for consideration in conference; if it is accepted, I should be glad to let it be handled in that way. Otherwise, I should wish to have perhaps 30 minutes, or approximately that much time, to discuss it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am endeavoring to accommodate the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as much as possible, in connection with the measure we expect to take up following this one, and he is trying to have it brought up as soon as possible. I was trying to help him out.

But I shall be glad to provide in the unanimous-consent agreement for the voting to begin at 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who will have charge of the time?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. WHERRY. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will it be understood, in connection with the agreement, that the Senator from Georgia will have 30 minutes, if necessary, for his matter, and that my colleague from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I will have 30 minutes for our matter, if necessary?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman of the committee and is in charge of the bill. Whatever is agreeable to him will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have it understood that I shall have at least 30 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, we could convene at 11 o'clock on Monday, and could arrange to have the voting begin at 3 o'clock that would give us 4 hours.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With the understanding that I shall have 30 minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware, I suppose, would wish to have time allotted him by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that can be arranged between those Senators; the Senators on the other side of the aisle never have difficulty in making arrangements with one another.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; we are one happy family.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not in favor of a "not-later-than" provision in the unanimous-consent agreement, for when such a provision is included in an agreement, Senators are in doubt as to the exact time when the voting will begin and are unable to make definite arrangements with regard to their time during the preceding hours on that day.

So I suggest that the agreement definitely provide for the voting to commence at 4 o'clock on Monday. If the majority leader wishes to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock on Monday, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next,

following the recess of the Senate from tonight until Monday, the Senate proceed to vote on the pending joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) and all amendments thereto, at 4 o'clock p. m.; provided, that no amendment which is not germane shall be considered; and provided further, that the time between 12 o'clock noon and 4 p. m. on said day shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in that connection, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the requirement for having a quorum call.

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

The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Without objection, the agreement is entered into.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George A. Garrett, of the District of Columbia, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ireland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.

John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Edward S. Parker, of South Carolina.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James E. Bowers, of North Carolina.
Thaddeus C. Martin, of Arkansas.
Harold M. Midkiff, of Virginia.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Osborne A. Pearson, of California, to be Assistant Postmaster General. (To fill vacancy created by appointment of Vincent C. Burke to the position of Deputy Postmaster General under authority of sec. 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949.)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert A. Riddell, of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Charles S. Hatfield, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Richard T. Ackley	John L. Appel, Jr.
William Acosta	Robert J. Armstrong
Robert D. Albright	Henry J. Arnold
John R. Allen	Richard W. Arnold, Jr.
Roger D. Alling	Paul W. Arthur
Allen E. Alman	Anthony A. Attardi
Daniel G. Anderson, Jr.	Robert I. Backstrom
	Donald C. Buseck
Lyle C. Anderson	James E. Johnson
Ralph E. Anfang	Jack C. Scarborough, Jr.
William M. Apgar	

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Francis B. Quinlan	John B. Sherman
Alois E. Schmitt, Jr.	Max L. Washington

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Renato D. Stefano, Jr.	Harvey M. Soldan
Byron A. Nilsson	Gene F. Straube

James H. Longworth (Naval Reserve aviator) to be an ensign in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William N. Grammer
Ray B. Mueller

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lawrence B. Frey, Jr.	Donald C. Olson
Thomas R. Haufe	Burton D. Ostergren

Goldie D. Greer to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 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 of all mercies, in a world swept by violent forces with which unaided we cannot cope, Thou only art our help and our hope. Through all the mystery of life Thy strong arm alone can lead us to its mastery. Thou hast made of our very restlessness a sign that without Thee we cannot be satisfied.

Fronting the claimant duties of this new week, steady our spirits with the realization of untapped power available to servants of Thy will if only they go quietly and confidently about their appointed tasks. Forgive us the distrust of ourselves, of life, and of Thee, and for the cowardly doubts which blind us to the heights which are full of the chariots of God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 25, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1990) 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 annual reports to 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 Committees on Armed Services in the Congress.

The message also announced that the act (S. 2681) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, having been presented to the President on February 14, 1950, and not having been signed by him within the 10-day period prescribed by the Constitution, had become a law without approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2328. An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office; and

H. R. 7220. An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

ABDUCTION OF GREEK CHILDREN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the problem of the displaced Greek children ever since it was brought to the attention of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans in 1948 by the Greek Government, which charged that thousands of Greek children were being forcibly abducted by the guerrillas for Communist indoctrination in the eastern European countries and as a means of further terrorizing the Greek countryside. The findings of that special committee revealed that approximately 25,000 children had been removed to Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and other countries in eastern Europe. We all know that the efforts of the United Nations and of the International Committee of the Red Cross have so far failed to succeed in remedying this truly tragic and unjustifiable condition. I have asked the