

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

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

Rev. George M. Docherty, D. D., minister, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Everlasting God, who art the Lord of Hosts, and who in ancient days set up a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night to guide Thy chosen people through famine and plague and the pestilence of war unto the land of promise; grant to our Nation in these critical days such a vision and the certitude of Thy blessings and guidance. And especially to those who sit in this Chamber. Do Thou, O Heavenly Father, enable them to hear above the thunder of the world Thy still, small voice. Give them clear insights and calm courage and in all the grave decisions they must make the knowledge that they are servants not only of the people but servants of God. To this end do we dedicate our lives today, O Lord, that this world, which in our time has by man's achievement become a neighborhood, may by the power and the presence of Thy Holy Spirit become a brotherhood of men and nations. Through Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBERTSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 7, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9780) providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LODGE was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. ROBERTSON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary (H. R. 9286). A bill for the relief of Maria Manfrini; without amendment (Rept. No. 3153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9845. A bill for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces; without amendment (Rept. No. 3154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 297. An act for the relief of Ruggiero Di Costanzo; without amendment (Rept. No. 3155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 995. An act for the relief of Irene George Livanos; without amendment (Rept. No. 3156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 752. An act for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 3157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1816. An act for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 3158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2179. An act for the relief of Stephen A. Patkay and his wife, Madeleine; without amendment (Rept. No. 3159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2420. An act for the relief of Shaoul Minashi Shami, Emily Shami, Joseph Clement Shami, and Charles Henry Shami; without amendment (Rept. No. 3160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2702. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel; without amendment (Rept. No. 3161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2799. An act for the relief of Johan Wilhelm Adriaans; without amendment (Rept. No. 3162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2803. An act for the relief of Angela Maria Pisano; without amendment (Rept. No. 3163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2961. An act for the relief of Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 3164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2963. An act for the relief of Chen Hua Huang; without amendment (Rept. No. 3165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3066. An act for the relief of Dionisio Aguirre Irastorza; without amendment (Rept. No. 3166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3067. An act for the relief of Andres Aguirre Irastorza; without amendment (Rept. No. 3167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3091. An act for the relief of Master Stanley (Zachne) Hiller; without amendment (Rept. No. 3168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3329. An act for the relief of Kiyomi Kitamura; without amendment (Rept. No. 3169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3406. An act for the relief of Lee Yee Yen; without amendment (Rept. No. 3170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3430. An act for the relief of Martina Arnalz Zarandona (Sister Blanca Eugenia); without amendment (Rept. No. 3171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3444. An act for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall; without amendment (Rept. No. 3172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3484. An act for the relief of Barbara Sugihara; without amendment (Rept. No. 3173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 4072. An act for the relief of Ella Stufka and her son; without amendment (Rept. No. 3174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 4074. An act for the relief of Pamela Bentley; without amendment (Rept. No. 3175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 4111. An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 3176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 9880. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 881, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9881. A bill to amend section 215 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit officers or employees of the United States from accepting payments for appointment or retention of a person in office or employment under the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. Res. 887. Resolution recommending the resignation of the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 9882. A bill for the relief of Sam Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 9883. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 9884. A bill for the relief of Elena Erbez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9885. A bill for the relief of Adelaida Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 9886. A bill for the relief of Fares Nujra Saliba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9887. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harumi China Cairns and George Thomas Cairns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEMAND FOR RECOGNITION OF CITIZENS OF NORTH DAKOTA IN APPOINTMENTS TO PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last evening when the calendar was called in executive session I did not object to the confirmation of the various individuals who had been nominated to office. Time and time again on the floor of the Senate I have called the attention of the Senate and of the administration to the fact that no citizen of North Dakota has been named to head any important office. Year after year has gone by without any citizen of North Dakota being nominated to any such office. At the present time no citizen of North Dakota is serving as ambassador or consul, and you all know that there is no better group of people anywhere than North Dakota people. One New York man after another has been named, and at one time there were six members of the Cabinet who had been appointed from the State of New York, and last night we confirmed another New Yorker.

Mr. President, I am serving notice that the next time the Senate is called on to confirm anyone to head any office I propose to oppose the confirmation. I shall do all in my power to see to it that the people of North Dakota finally get the recognition to which they have been entitled ever since the State was admitted into the Union in 1889. I want the Senators to know exactly how I feel on the subject. I have taken up the matter time and time again, and if in order to get results I must cause delay and take the time of the Senate, even in these critical times, I propose to do it. North Dakota is a part of these United States, the citizens pay a large share of the taxes, and I propose to see that some citizens from there will have something to do with the real operation of this Government.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator has said—and I can well understand the thoughts in his mind—I would suggest that he whisper in the ear of the President and start at the source.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 3295, the so-called railway-labor bill, is before the Senate, and the pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. CAPEHART. That estops any additional amendment being offered until the pending amendment is disposed of?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct; unless an amendment is offered to the pending amendment.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill is open to amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be open to amendment after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CAPEHART. After the pending amendment is disposed of; but no amendment can be offered now unless it is an amendment to the pending amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Alken	Holland	Myers
Anderson	Hunt	Neely
Brewster	Ives	Nixon
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kefauver	Pepper
Byrd	Kem	Robertson
Cain	Kerr	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Carlson	Knowland	Schoeppel
Chapman	Langer	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Long	Stennis
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McCarran	Taylor
Douglas	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworthak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eaton	McFarland	Thye
Ellender	McKellar	Tobey
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
George	Malone	Watkins
Gillette	Martin	Wherry
Gurney	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	Millikin	Williams
Hendrickson	Morse	Young
Hickenlooper	Mundt	
Hill	Murray	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator

from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, December 8, 1950, he signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 5967) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CREDENTIALS

Mr. MCFARLAND presented the credentials of CARL HAYDEN, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE HOUSE,

Phoenix, Ariz., December 4, 1950.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, CARL HAYDEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, DAN E. GARVEY, and our seal hereto affixed at Phoenix, this 4th day of December A. D. 1950.

[SEAL]

DAN E. GARVEY,
Governor.

By the Governor.
Attest:

WESLEY BOLIN,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of contracts negotiated by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

A letter from A. Schon, for the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Oslo, Norway, transmitting copies of a circular with regard to the award of the Nobel peace prize in 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC., DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the twenty-eighth annual convention of the Minnesota division, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., at Duluth, Minn., on September 29-30, 1950, relat-

ing to the conservation of waterfowl and other wildlife.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE TWENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MINNESOTA DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC., DULUTH, MINN., SEPTEMBER 29-30, 1950

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas extensive farm drainage, especially of potholes and marshes, stimulated by Federal aid furnished through the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration under the Department of Agriculture, has done widespread and irreparable damage to the habitat for waterfowl and other wild life: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League in convention assembled at Duluth, Minn., this 30th day of September 1950 as follows:

1. We recognize the right of farmers to improve their land by drainage, but we remind them that wild life has great value to farmers and to the public, that the protection and development of wild life habitat benefits farms and enhances their value, and we urge them to make full allowance for this in connection with their drainage projects.

2. We believe that under present economic conditions the promotion of farm drainage by Federal aid, especially the payment of cash subsidies, is unnecessary and unsound, although we recognize that certain types of drainage are necessary for good farming and that some drainage is beneficial to wild life. We therefore urge Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture to stop the payment of cash subsidies for drainage immediately.

RESOLUTION 6

Whereas there is urgent need for better coordination and control of Federal agencies dealing with protection or development of natural resources in order to eliminate confusion and conflict among present separate agencies, prevent waste of public funds on ill-advised and ineffective projects, promote efficiency and economy in administration, and to secure adequate consideration for wildlife and other natural resources as well as other public interests; and

Whereas the reorganization of the Government agencies concerned as recommended by the Hoover Commission or its task force on natural resources would involve difficult and controversial problems which would delay action; and

Whereas a large degree of effective coordination and control over Federal projects affecting waters and other natural resources could be accomplished by creation of a Board of Review to pass on such projects, which could furnish along with existing agencies and which would not interfere with ultimate reorganization of those agencies under any plan that may be adopted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to establish at once a Board of Review for all Federal projects affecting waters and other natural resources as recommended by the minority report of the Hoover Commission and the Task Force on Natural Resources.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas the existing act under which the Corps of Army Engineers administers the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries, provides for recognition of use for navigation only; and

Whereas wildlife and recreational values have become of tremendous value and importance since the passage of this act: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Minnesota Division of the Izaak Walton League urges that the basic and covering administration of all Federal water-control projects on the upper

Mississippi River and tributaries be amended to require adequate consideration for wildlife, recreation, and other conservation uses as well as navigation, flood-control, and other public interests.

RESOLUTION 24

Whereas the recreational and wildlife values are as important as the timber values of our national forests; and

Whereas United States Forest Service management is out of balance in having all their men work on timber and none on wildlife: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Minnesota Division, Izaak Walton League of America, request the United States Congress to appropriate funds for the United States Forest Service to employ wildlife managers on both the Chippewa and Superior National Forests, and that this request be made known to all Minnesota Congressmen.

RESOLUTIONS OF TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on October 31, it was my pleasure to attend the twenty-first annual convention of the Nation's largest milk producers' cooperative—The Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin. I joined with over 1,534 delegates, members and guests in reviewing the accomplishments of the PMPC during the last year and considering the problems faced by the great membership of this organization in the present and in the future.

So large is the annual production of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative that the members of this single cooperative produce more milk than is produced by 24 entire States of the 48 States in our Union. For the year ending August 31, 1950, PMPC members produced 1,379,000,000 pounds of milk, and production this year is expected to hit 1,500,000,000 pounds.

Because dairying is so crucial to Wisconsin's future and to the health of the entire Nation, I believe that the resolutions adopted by this great organization will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent therefore that there be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, the text of those resolutions adopted by the convention which pertain to national affairs, and that the text be followed by an enumeration of officers and directors of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative.

There being no objection, the resolutions together with the enumeration of officers and directors, were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND FARM PRICES IN TIMES OF EMERGENCIES

1. The threat of war and actual war in Korea causes our Government to increase our military forces to approximate war strength. This will inevitably alter the price situation for dairy products. It will alter the habits of production for all agricultural products as well as the production habits of industry. These changes, in all probability, will call for controls. It may be necessary to adopt rationing programs. History proves that emergencies affect all prices, but not proportionately. Emergencies also affect supply and demand, but not in direct proportion with respect to all commodities.

2. In view of the facts set forth above, Pure Milk Products Cooperative wishes to bring

forcefully to the attention of the Congress and administration the need for serious consideration of (1) rationing problems, (2) comparable prices for dairy products under any price control that may be necessary.

With respect to rationing, we call attention to the many unjust and unfair rationing policies that were adopted in the last war. A program of rationing on butter and other dairy products was of such force that it caused a lasting change in the eating habits of an overwhelming majority of our national population to the eternal detriment of the consumption of dairy products and especially butter. Butter was rationed while other spreads to imitate butter were given a preferential freedom position with respect to rationing. For example: Rationing coupons that could have been used for butter were of necessity used for red meats while substitutes and imitations were left free to depress the use of butter. We condemn such a policy and urge and demand that the Congress and administration give this matter serious consideration if and when a rationing program becomes necessary.

COMPARABLE PRICES

If it becomes necessary to fix prices on agricultural products and especially milk, we demand that the Congress or such other price-fixing body charged with such authority be given mandatory authorization to fix prices for dairy products on a comparable basis without respect to the application of parity formula if full parity or any other price plan should not yield a price to dairy products at least comparable to other agricultural crops or commodities during the same period chosen for basic price-fixing plants.

3. We, the delegate body of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, in annual convention this 31st day of October 1950, further resolve that it shall be the duty of the State board of directors to take such action as will be in keeping with the intent reflected herein to bring about the price and rationing relationship as may be necessary due to changed conditions that may take place in the interim of convention of the delegates of this cooperative.

FARM SURPLUSES

1. As long as there is a surplus of dairy products, we must devise ways and means of handling such surpluses. We, therefore, reaffirm last year's resolutions respecting dairy surplus.

2. In uncertain times like the present, it is impossible to formulate a permanent plan for handling agricultural surpluses. We recommend that present governmental price supports and governmental purchasing shall be maintained until such time as supply and demand are approximately balanced.

3. Both the butter and the dried-milk industry should begin at once to examine their merchandising and advertising techniques. Too great a dependence is placed by these two industries on Government-purchasing policies. We commend our universities for the part they have played in research and consumer education in a effort to further the consumption of dried-milk and butter.

4. Wisconsin milk producers' prices for milk sold for manufactured dairy products, such as evaporated milk, cheese, and butter-powder operations, have historically been higher than the national average price received by producers for like production. For several months during this year a few privately owned plant operators in Wisconsin have failed to pay Wisconsin milk producers the calculated support price provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation plus the historical differential over the national average price.

In most cases these same companies have enjoyed a market with the Commodity Credit Corporation for their finished products.

It is our view that the Government purchase program was designed to support price to dairy farmers. We believe that the program is being defeated by such practice and that flagrant abuse is being made of the program at the expense of the dairy producers.

Therefore, we respectfully request that the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency charged with the administration of the support program cease to buy dairy products from any privately owned company that fails to pay the calculated support price plus the historical differentials.

Provided, however, that producers shall report such practices to the proper authorities and, provided further, that purchase by Government will be resumed upon proof satisfactory to the Government that such buyers have and will pay producers in keeping with the intent of the Government purchase program.

TRADE BARRIERS

1. (a) During the past year, we have heard a good deal about trade barriers. Trade barriers are especially harmful to Wisconsin dairymen, due to the fact that approximately 85 percent of our milk is sold outside the boundaries of the State. We believe, however, that there is a great deal of misunderstanding on the part of Wisconsin dairymen as to what constitutes a trade barrier. Many so-called trade barriers are simply the result of the operation of natural economic laws. We must remember that production costs, freight rates, geographical position of a market, and local demand are the usual factors governing the sale of milk on any given market.

(b) Trade barriers do exist. We condemn any local health regulation, the effect of which is to impede or prevent the natural flow of milk. We condemn provisions of Federal milk marketing orders which are not based on sound economy or true costs where or when the sole purpose of such provision is to build a wall about a city market for the protection of selfish minority groups.

2. We urge our manager or president to appear before the Gillette committees, which is investigating trade barriers, to explain in its true light Pure Milk Products Cooperative's attitude toward this important issue.

SUBSTITUTE AND SYNTHETIC FOODS

1. Great changes have taken place since the adjournment of our last annual convention in respect to oleomargarine. The first battle over colored oleo has been lost in Congress. The fight against unfair competition between dairy products and substitutes must go on.

A. Since Congress has seen fit to remove the color ban for margarine, we insist that they appropriate ample funds for the enforcement of the present law. Rigid enforcement of the law is the only protection that the dairymen, on the one hand, and the consuming public on the other, can expect against the fraud of the margarine industry. Congress certainly owes the dairymen and the public this protection.

B. We urge our sister States who still have color bans against margarine on their statute books to hold the line against all pressure to remove the same.

2. On July 21, 1950, the State board adopted a resolution relative to synthetic foods. We commend their action and adopt a like resolution at this time.

A. This Nation, from the time of its founding, has depended for its chief food supply on the natural products of agriculture, such as grain, livestock, dairy products, and poultry. Through the years there has developed an immense food-processing industry which utilizes enormous quantities of these natu-

ral agricultural, livestock, dairy, and poultry products in meeting the daily nutritional requirements of the people. An ever-increasing portion of the Nation's food supply is being industrially processed, which processing has a direct bearing on the character of the national diet and standards of public health.

Certain chemicals, inorganic compounds, and synthetic materials are being used on an ever-increasing scale in the processing and preparation of various food products. Under existing laws there is no requirement that the chemicals, compounds, inorganic materials, and synthetics must be demonstrated to be nontoxic before being introduced into the food stream of the Nation. It appears reasonably certain that many of the chemicals, compounds, and inorganic materials and synthetics are being used to reduce or replace in foods organic material of great importance to the Nation's diet. The trends represented by the use of these chemicals, compounds, inorganic materials, and synthetics present a serious problem, not only to the health and welfare of our people but also to the future stability and well-being of our entire agricultural economy. The utilization of chemicals to replace milk solids, animal and vegetable fats and oils, as well as eggs, in the processing of food threatens heavy inroads into the production of these items by the agricultural segment of our economy.

The House of Representatives has recently adopted a resolution providing for the appointment of a special investigating committee to investigate this whole problem and report the same with recommendations for legislation to the next Congress. The Speaker, pursuant to the authority of such resolutions, has appointed a special committee to make such an investigation.

1. We heartily endorse the action of the Congress in providing for the appointment of such special investigating committee and heartily endorse the objectives of said committee.

2. We demand that the pure food and drug laws be suitably amended so as to put the burden upon any individual or corporation seeking to introduce a new chemical into the food stream of the Nation to demonstrate by clinical evidence that such chemical is not injurious over a long period to the health of the people.

3. We recommend that legislation be enacted granting to the Food and Drug Administration powers of subpoena to enable it to more effectively and efficiently protect the public interest and the public food supply.

4. That this convention extend to FRANK B. KEEFE, Congressman from Wisconsin, its vote of appreciation and thanks for the scholarly research and untiring effort he has extended in bringing about the appointment of the above congressional committee.

FEDERAL ORDERS

We reaffirm our belief in an order for evaporated milk. We urge the State board and manager to do everything in their power to consummate our long years of endeavor to obtain an evaporated milk order.

2. Federal fluid milk orders have been under fire the last year. We realize that Federal orders are not perfect, but we believe that Federal order, if properly devised and executed, is the best means yet invented to maintain a plentiful supply of healthful fluid milk for the consuming public on the one hand and an orderly market with fair prices to producers on the other.

3. The administration of Federal milk orders has been eminently successful. This successful administration has been due mainly to the fact that control of funds and personnel has been kept under local management. At no time has political or bureaucratic interference entered into the pic-

ture. Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes that the efficient administration of an order depends on a maximum freedom of action on the part of the Administrator and a minimum of interference on the part of the Federal Government. We are greatly opposed to and alarmed at the present tendency of the Production and Marketing Administration, whereby control over certain funds and personnel is being taken away from local authority and centralized in Washington. This movement will tend to decrease the authority of the Market Administrator, thereby decreasing administrative efficiency and increasing administrative costs.

Since Federal orders are financed by the milk markets, not by taxpayers, we suggest to the Production and Marketing Administration that their movement to centralize authority over Federal markets be discontinued.

DAIRY DIVISION

1. Your manager or president never go to Washington but what they visit the Dairy Division. Pure Milk Products Cooperative appreciates the important part the Dairy Division plays in the economy of the dairy farmer. We sincerely appreciate the fact that our relationships with the various departments of the Division have been cordial and cooperative. We take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Preston Richards as the new Chief of the Dairy Division. We pledge him our support in his efforts to promote the dairy interests of the Nation.

2. Pure Milk Products Cooperative is a commodity organization. We represent the interests of all dairymen. No single branch of the milk industry can be unduly emphasized to the detriment of other branches. Pure Milk Products Cooperative realizes that milk going into fluid channels and milk going into manufactured channels are of equal importance to the stability of the industry and that a balance of emphasis must be maintained at all times between fluid and manufactured milk.

A. We urge the Chief of the Dairy Division to bear this important fact in mind at all times. Absolute equality of emphasis should be maintained in the division between fluid and manufactured milk. Division heads working in fluid milk should have equal rank with division heads working in manufactured milk.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

1. Freight rates on dairy products are increasing each succeeding year. Wisconsin dairymen find it exceedingly difficult to sell their product competitively in the populous eastern markets, due to high transportation costs.

2. Water transportation, compared to rail transportation, is cheap. The development of the St. Lawrence waterway would reduce the freight costs to eastern markets materially. The enactment of no single measure before Congress would benefit the dairy farmer as much as the passage of the St. Lawrence waterway.

3. We, therefore, reaffirm all past resolutions relative to the St. Lawrence waterway. Once again we urge Congress to pass the proper enabling legislation and to appropriate sufficient funds for construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

4. Gratitude is a virtue, the expression of which is too often neglected. This is especially true of farm organizations. We are prone to accept the unselfish service of our leaders and our public servants without expressing our appreciation. Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes it is proper in this convention to publicly thank Wisconsin Representatives and Senators for the United States Senate for the St. Lawrence waterway.

QUART OF MILK A DAY

Every day more and more scientific evidence is supplied to prove that milk does more for the body than any other food. Medical history records prove that the people who have achieved, those who have become large, virgorous, strong people, those people who have reduced their infant mortality, who have the best trades in the world, those who are progressive in science and in every activity of human intellect—are the people who have used abundant amounts of milk and its products. Large industries are in greater numbers each year resorting to the use of milk in their factories to improve employees' health and reduce fatigue. The results show a reduction in accidents with an improvement in safety, and increased production, and better health are reported where milk is being served between meals or added to the diet.

Therefore, we, the members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, believe that the men and women of our Armed Forces should have an abundance of milk, the essential food beverage, to give them the strength and spirit to carry on, and we earnestly urge the Congress to provide ways and means so that our Armed Forces, wherever they may be, shall have at least a quart of milk or its equivalent each day.

DRAFT

The draft for war affects all Americans and should do so equally. Through selective service, rural America will continue its past contribution to our country's defense.

Presently, it appears that most draft boards feel that farming is not considered essential, and, in Wisconsin, no consideration is being given to our replacement of a man—and which often forces our discontinuance of dairying.

The farmer with one employee can't find a replacement as easily as the factory owner with 100 or 1,000 employees. This is particularly true in Wisconsin, where diversified and specialized farming requires special skills and where industry has already drained the countryside by higher wages.

The farmer doesn't want blanket exemption. Equal treatment under selective service with city folks requires that some consideration be given to our replacement of the drafted men. The present plan of drafting farmers (apparently there are only city draft boards) without opportunity to find a replacement works a hardship on the dairy farmer and will result in a national loss of essential foods produced.

Why the dairy farmer with one hired man can't receive the same consideration as the industrialist with 10,000 employees we can't understand.

Therefore be it resolved that the selective service, in drafting farmers, consider the need for replacement of our skills, the need for dairying and permit sufficient time to find a man. The present policy will force a sale and discontinuance of farming. It unfairly favors the city industrial and service establishments.

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

William F. Groves, president, fourth district, Lodi, Wis.

Henry Meier, vice president, ninth district, Merrill, Wis.

Edward R. Featherstone, secretary, second district, Walworth, Wis.

Charles J. Rode, treasurer, fifth district, Hartford, Wis.

William O. Perdue, general manager, central office, Fond du Lac, Wis.

DIRECTORS

William H. Peters, first district, Junction City, Wis.

William Bauman, third district, Middleton, Wis.

Henry Heimann, sixth district, Chilton, Wis.

Charles A. Peterson, seventh district, Rosendale, Wis.

Fred B. Larsen, eighth district, Weyauwega, Wis.

Paul W. Affeldt, tenth district, Sparta, Wis.

Ronald Casey, eleventh district, New Richmond, Wis.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. ANDERSON introduced Senate bill 4236, to provide for the development and regulation of methods of weather modification and control, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 4237. A bill for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 4238. A bill for the relief of Hara Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympcha Shpak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 4239. A bill for the relief of Arthur Koestler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WEATHER CONTROL ACT OF 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the Weather Control Act of 1951, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared, together with statements by Dr. E. J. Workman, of the New Mexico School of Mines, and Vincent J. Schaefer, of the General Electric Research Laboratory, Schenectady, N. Y., on artificial inducement of precipitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statements presented by the Senator from New Mexico will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 4236) to provide for the development and regulation of methods of weather modification and control, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statements presented by Mr. ANDERSON are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON ON WEATHER CONTROL BILL

I have today introduced a bill to provide for the development and regulation of methods of weather modification and control. To some persons this may be considered somewhat presumptuous, if not sacrilegious, as there are those who say that they are still willing to leave the weather to divine providence. To this I can only reply that in my judgment the sphere of divine providence is no more invaded by weather control than by the splitting of the atom. Occasional dramatic events such as the recent New York water shortage, or the dust storms of a few years ago, or hurricanes, or other great disturbances of nature serve to remind us that the weather is one of the most important factors in our everyday lives. Without sufficient rainfall our agriculture is seriously affected; problems of health and adequate water supply are drastically increased. On the other hand, periods of se-

vere storms or excessive rainfall bring devastating floods, ruin crops, and take their toll in injury and damage to lives and property. The transportation of goods and persons, military problems of national defense, and, indeed, every activity in which we engage is affected directly or indirectly by the weather.

At this point, I suppose I should recognize that some will inquire, quite properly, as to the constitutional basis for this type of legislation. I do not propose to discuss that feature in detail. It will doubtless be adequately considered in committee. I want only to say that there is no doubt in my mind that this is a proper subject of Federal legislation. As to specific constitutional sources of power I need only refer to the commerce clause and the war power. I call to mind in connection with the commerce clause the regulation of air navigation, water navigation (flood control and improvement of navigable waters), and radio communication. These are to me convincing considerations, leaving aside the interstate movement of the clouds themselves, and are sufficient to justify Federal legislation by specific reference to the clause itself or under the necessary and proper clause. With regard to the war power the analogy to atomic energy is plain and to my mind equally as potent. It was General Kenny who said, "The nation which first learns to plot the paths of air masses accurately and learns to control the time and place of precipitation will dominate the globe."

To give an idea of developments in this field I am having my remarks accompanied by two statements prepared for this purpose by Dr. E. J. Workman, president of the New Mexico School of Mines at Socorro, N. M., who has been working in close coordination with General Electric scientists on artificial precipitation, and by Dr. Vincent J. Schaefer of the General Electric research laboratory at Schenectady. As will be observed from Dr. Workman's statement "the era of scientific weather control began some 4 years ago when Dr. Vincent J. Schaefer of General Electric Co. made his now famous announcements concerning dry ice in a refrigerated box and supercooled clouds." On November 22, 1950, I flew up to Schenectady and personally met with a group studying the problem at the General Electric laboratory—Dr. Irving Langmuir, Dr. Vincent Schaefer, Dr. Bernard Vonnegut, and, of course, Dr. Guy Suits, vice president and research director of General Electric at Schenectady. Possibly Senators may have already read various articles in Time or Pathfinder magazines about the activities of Dr. Langmuir, a Nobel prize winner. An interesting article about these scientists may also be found in the Saturday Evening Post, issue of October 25, 1947, on page 24, wherein Dr. Suits is quoted as saying that developments in modification of weather phenomena are "possibly as important in terms of benefits to mankind as atomic energy."

The bill in general follows the outline of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, that is, it in effect places weather modification and control activities exclusively under the control of the Federal Government. I recognize that there are competent and well-meaning persons both within and without the Government who take the position that regulation in this field is premature, and that we have not yet gained the knowledge upon which to base comprehensive legislative regulation. Equally competent persons take the opposite view, and point out that while it is a field in which unknown factors are involved, the implications are so great that it is better now to seek the application of measures with proper safeguards. With this latter group I agree. I am not so sure that from a scientific standpoint it is not just as important to deal with this subject

now as it was to deal with atomic energy at the time of the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. It is probable that economic benefits may be realized much sooner than in the case of atomic energy. I am not so sure, either, that weather modification and control is not closely related, at least from the standpoint of national security, to the utilization of atomic energy as a military weapon. In any event I am convinced that an attempt to set up intelligent regulation should be made immediately, even though it will necessarily be subject to revision from time to time as the results of weather control measures become more predictable. To my mind it is a question of intelligent regulation now or continued haphazard interference with the weather with no central authority to channel the course of these measures in the national interest.

When it is considered that the potentialities in this field go all the way from inducing, increasing, or preventing precipitation, to changing the course, or modifying the intensity, of a thunderstorm or a hurricane, the almost terrifying implications seem to me to make it obvious that the Federal Government should occupy this field now. While research and experimentation in the field of weather modification and control have attained the stage at which the application of scientific advances in this field has practical significance, the effect of the use of such measures upon the social, economic, and political structures of our country and upon national security is yet to be determined. This is a field in which uncommon factors and unsolved problems are involved. As stated in the bill which I have introduced, it is reasonable to anticipate, however, that effective modification and control of the weather will cause or produce profound changes in our present way of life and will result in far-reaching benefits to and untold developments in agriculture, industry, commerce, and the general welfare. While the ultimate extent to which measures for weather control may be utilized is still speculative, the application of such measures without proper safeguards, sufficient data, and accurate information may result in inadequate or excessive precipitation; may cause catastrophic droughts, storms, floods, and other phenomena with consequent loss of life and property, injury to navigable streams and other channels of interstate and foreign commerce, injury to water supplies for municipal, irrigation, and industrial purposes, and injury to sources of hydroelectric power. Such measures, improperly applied, may also impede the production and transportation of goods and services for domestic consumption and export, may impair or hinder the national defense, and in many other ways may adversely affect the general welfare of the people of the United States. Moreover, thorough experimentation in, and application of, such measures will of necessity affect areas extending across State and even international boundaries.

Accordingly, it seems clear that further experimentation in and application of measures for weather control are matters of national concern which cannot and should not be left to haphazard and undirected private and individual action, uncontrolled by any responsible body and without any comprehensive planning for uniform and beneficial development. Believing that the time has come for definite action to correct this situation I have introduced S. 4236, the purpose of which is to insure that maximum benefits may result from weather modification and control; to regulate and supervise all those who attempt to engage in such activity; to correlate and evaluate the information derived from such activity; and to achieve cooperation with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof concerning

such activity, all to the end of encouraging the intelligent and beneficial development of weather modification and control, preventing its harmful and indiscriminate exercise and fostering sound economic conditions in the public interest.

To achieve these purposes the bill provides for four major programs relating to weather modification or control:

1. A program of assisting and fostering private research and development to encourage maximum scientific progress.
2. A program of federally conducted research and development to assure the Government of adequate scientific and technical accomplishment.
3. A program for Government control of experiments and operations in order to advance the general welfare, assure the common defense and national security, and to promote the broadest possible exploitation of the field.
4. A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing policies and with international arrangements made by the United States, and which will enable the Congress to be currently informed so as to take further legislative action as may hereafter be appropriate.

These programs will be under the supervision of and administered by a Weather Control Commission, an independent agency, assisted by a General Advisory Committee, a Military Liaison Committee, and an Interdepartmental Advisory Board.

The Commission is directed to exercise its powers in such manner as to insure the continued conduct of research and development activities in specified fields of weather modification and control by private or public institutions or persons and to assist in the acquisition of an ever-expanding fund of theoretical and practical knowledge in such field. The Commission may also conduct its own research and experimentation.

I have one additional matter which I wish to discuss briefly, more to bring up the problem than to attempt an adequate solution. The bill I have introduced provides for Government assumption of the liability of its contractors growing out of performance of their contracts. I believe this method to be preferable to that of providing merely for indemnification of Government contractors. Indemnification alone will not give private contractors the protection which I believe is essential if this important work is to go forward in the most effective manner. Any indemnification provision by its very nature will always be unsatisfactory in the following respects:

1. Such a provision always subjects the contractor to the responsibilities inherent in having the initial liability.
2. Such a provision requires the contractor to assume or at least participate in the defense of any action brought against him.
3. Such a provision always subjects the contractor to the possibility of an attachment or execution against his property which even though temporary might very seriously affect his operations.
4. Such a provision does not give the contractor a complete guarantee against liability because of the limitations inherent in congressional appropriations or in Government certification.
5. Such a provision subjects the Government to liability with respect to judgments rendered by courts other than Federal courts.

I suppose it may be charged that in this provision the Government is buying a pig in a poke. It is true that in the field of weather control there is what has been described as an odd legal vacuum. But in due course the fields of alleged responsibility and ownership will be charted by the courts and at least in the initial stages the Government must assume responsibility because of the grave public interest involved. I am frank to say

that at this time questions of legal liability arising out of operations in the field of weather control defy solution. Competent authorities have written learned articles seeking analogies from water law, the law of the airspace (that is, air navigation), the migration of wildlife, and the radio's ether. In my judgment one can only speculate as to who is liable for what in this field. I need only point out that the conflicting interests, for example, in inducing or preventing precipitation, may be summed up by saying that what may be a boon to the farmer or ranchman may be a washout to the operator of the baseball club or the county fair, to use only one field in which precipitation may be damaging if not disastrous; or as one writer has put it "who owns the clouds?". I invite a careful reading of the findings and declaration in section 2 of the bill which I believe will serve to emphasize the gravity of the problem.

There follows a brief section-by-section analysis of the bill:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 provides a short title, the Weather Control Act of 1951.

Section 2 embodies the declaration of policy, consisting of a statement of findings and a declaration, and a brief outline of the purpose of the act.

Section 3 provides for the organization of a Weather Control Commission to administer the act, and provides for a general civilian advisory committee, a military liaison committee, and an interdepartmental advisory board, to advise the Commission in the several phases of its operations.

Section 4 provides for assistance to private or public institutions or persons in the fields of weather modification and control, and also authorizes the Commission to engage in activities in such field.

Section 5 provides for military applications of weather modification and control and includes authority in the Commission to conduct experiments and do research and development work in this field and also authorizes the President to direct the Commission to authorize the Armed Forces to engage in activities for weather modification and control as a military operation.

Section 6 provides for the issuance of licenses to engage in activities for weather modification and control. In general no person may engage in such activities without a license issued by the Commission. In connection with the issuance of licenses the Commission may provide for the regulation of rates, fees, and charges for carrying out weather modification and control projects on a commercial basis. The Commission is also authorized to provide by regulation for exempting from the licensing requirements laboratory research and experiments and activities of an emergent character for protection against frost, ice, or fog. A typical example of the latter would be the well-known smudge pots to protect fruit trees against frost.

Section 7 recognizes the serious international implications of weather modification and control and in general provides for the subordination of domestic measures to international arrangements.

Section 8 outlines the general authority of the Commission, including the authority to establish advisory boards and the regulatory authority, and outlines the administrative powers of the Commission.

Section 9 deals with enforcement, and provides criminal penalties for violations, authorizes the use of the injunctive power, and provides machinery for requiring obedience to subpoenas of the Commission.

Section 10 provides for Government assumption of liability that might otherwise be imposed on Government contractors as a result of their activities.

Section 11 requires the Commission to report to Congress twice each year, in January and July.

Section 12 contains definitions.

Section 13 authorizes appropriations to carry out the act.

Section 14 is the usual separability clause.

I have touched only briefly upon the scientific aspects of the developments in this field. To supplement my statement I ask unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks statements by experts on the subject, to which I have previously referred, one by E. J. Workman, of the New Mexico School of Mines, and the other by Vincent J. Schaefer, of the General Electric Research Laboratory, Schenectady, N. Y.

NOTES ON ARTIFICIAL INDUCEMENT OF PRECIPITATION

(By Dr. E. J. Workman, New Mexico School of Mines, representing Water Resources Development Commission of the State of New Mexico, in presenting the following report to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission)

The question of water, whether it applies to atmospheric water or to ground water, is one of extreme importance. A large portion of our population has shifted to the arid States of the West. This and the increase in irrigation in all States has placed a new demand upon our water supply. Industrial processes which, as our economy develops, require more and more water, have added to the problem of supply and to the problem of pollution as well.

If we expect to maintain our present trend in standard of living and recreational facilities, additional water development must be made, and further conservation of existing water must be effected. The domestic consumption of water has increased enormously in the last two or three decades. Our demands are greater, quite independent of population increases or population shifts. Our per capita water requirements are larger—we use electric dishwashers and electric washing machines. Nearly all the domestic facilities of the home have increased the consumption of available water.

It is worth while, then, to examine today's methods of inducing artificially the precipitation of water from clouds.

One gains the impression from the public press that a very great amount of research is being done on methods of influencing rainfall by providing nuclei and ice crystals by various methods. Actually, while many people are engaged in activities dedicated to influencing precipitation, very few are engaged in basic research bearing on this important but not completely understood phenomena.

The era of scientific weather control began some four years ago when Dr. Vincent J. Schaefer of General Electric Co. made his now famous announcements concerning dry ice in a refrigerated box and supercooled clouds. The group studying the problem at General Electric is now large and the very extensive contributions of Dr. Irving Langmuir, Dr. Vincent Schaefer, Dr. Bernard Vonnegut, and others is well known. For a number of years New Mexico School of Mines has employed a group of men for research in artificial precipitation and related subjects and recently we have worked in close coordination with the General Electric scientists.

There is particularly good agreement among the scientists of the world as to the general physical processes of precipitation. While much is yet to be learned, it is agreed that the formation of ice in clouds is necessary to precipitation in temperate latitudes and no doubt is necessary also for heavy precipitation in tropical areas. In New Mexico we have studied thunderstorms and the

mechanisms of thunderstorm precipitation for several years and we concur with the view that the formation of ice is essential to precipitation. We know that ice forms in clouds at a temperature somewhat colder than the freezing point and that for optimum precipitation results ice should be produced in a thunderstorm at an altitude having a temperature of -15° to -30° C—preferably on the warmer side.

The process of sublimation which produces small ice crystals in clouds has been described by Schaefer and others. It is known that foreign material must be present in the atmosphere to serve as seeds on which small ice crystals may begin to form. These microscopic airborne particles are known as sublimation nuclei. In order to produce a snowstorm 1 foot in depth over an area of perhaps 1,000 square miles, something like 10^{10} sublimation nuclei must be present. It is not known precisely how many nuclei are needed for the production of the maximum amount of rain from thunderstorm, but it is safe to say that the number is somewhere between 10,000 and 100,000 per cubic meter.

The vital problem here is: How many of such sublimation nuclei occur naturally in the air? Meteorologists, in general, seem to have the impression that the atmosphere always contains an adequate number of these nuclei. Those of us who have made daily measurements of effective natural nuclei hold a different view.

Daily counts of nuclei have been made at Mount Washington in New Hampshire by the General Electric group under the direction of Dr. Schaefer, and in Socorro, New Mexico, by the School of Mines group. These observations of available nuclei are characterized first of all by the fact that the number of nuclei found varies greatly from day to day.

One million nuclei per cubic meter may occur, I believe, as much as 8 percent of the time in the winter on Mount Washington. Ten million nuclei per cubic meter have been found at Mount Washington once or twice in more than 8,000 readings. Usually, however, the number is quite small, varying from less than 10 to around 10,000 per cubic meter at -15° C. These figures represent maximum numbers, since they were obtained in the wintertime when minute ice crystals of surface origin might be involved in the counts at the Mount Washington station.

In the Southwest, at Socorro, the nuclei counts are not so optimistic. We find very few nuclei at any time which are effective at the relatively warm temperature of -15° C. We have noted, as have General Electric investigators, that the number of effective nuclei increases greatly as the temperature decreases. Generally, but not always, an adequate number of nuclei is found at temperatures as low as -21° or -22° C. This temperature corresponds to an elevation in the atmosphere of approximately 28,000 feet. It is interesting to note that this is the temperature at which we find evidence of precipitation in summer storms in New Mexico.

Bearing in mind the fact that precipitation does not result from clouds until ice has formed, information on the relative number of clouds which attain glaciation height is of interest. Careful studies made in New Mexico during the last summer indicate that approximately 90 percent of the clouds which otherwise might develop into thunderstorms do not reach this height. Many of the lower clouds among this 9 percent could be helped in the precipitation process by the artificial addition of ice-forming nuclei. We have photographed clouds which attain heights of 35,000 feet or more before glaciation occurs. These latter are the "pumping cirrus" clouds which Langmuir has described, and they demonstrate the complete lack of effective nuclei. This interesting meteorological phenomenon results

when the cloud height is so great that the temperature is below the critical temperature for ice formation; namely, about -40° C. At this temperature all cloud particles turn to ice.

What can be done to provide the additional rainfall so greatly needed in many parts of the United States? By the use of aircraft or suitable ground generators to add sublimation nuclei to the atmosphere, it is possible to increase the amount of rainfall. It is safe to say, in fact, that the application of scientific effort to this problem can enhance the rainfall by 25 to 75 percent. What should be added to the atmosphere, how much, and when, are serious and difficult questions.

Dr. Langmuir has suggested, and others among us are in agreement, that perhaps an increase in rainfall or snow precipitation in a particular locality may be significant in modifying the circulation pattern of the atmosphere. This possibility arises out of the fact that precipitation produces a heating effect in the atmosphere where it occurs. This heating, like the effects of sunshine, may introduce perturbations of sufficient magnitude to cause a great deal of what we call "weather."

These man-made changes in the climate, if demonstrated applicable to the problem, make the question of artificial precipitation one of national and possibly even international importance. This question should have vigorous application of research effort at this time.

With reference to this problem, winter snowfall presents certain favorable aspects in the western mountain areas. I believe that there is a general agreement among researchers in this field that snowfall can be modified quite easily by the addition of precipitation nuclei. From the standpoint of general safety and public interest, research in the artificial precipitation of snow may be very worth while.

In conclusion I would like to point out that the question of whether or not precipitation can be increased artificially is only one aspect of this new field of investigation.

For example, I feel almost certain that it is possible to moderate what otherwise would be a violent storm, whether the violence results from wind, excessive rainfall, hail, lightning, or combinations of these features.

I will be very happy to point out in detail how the question of artificial seeding of clouds relates to these important problems. I think it is unfortunate that so much controversy has grown up around this field of scientific investigation. Probably our greatest loss is in the fact that important subdivisions of our national Government thus far have not attached much importance to these questions.

Artificial precipitation is already very much in the public interest and I am certain that the time is near when it will be necessary to arrange control measures and provide special legislation. For this reason alone I think that the entire question should become the subject of intensive study by proper Federal agencies.

FACTORS RELATED TO EXPERIMENTAL METEOROLOGY

(By Vincent J. Schaefer, General Electric Research Laboratory, Schenectady, N. Y.)

Within the past 3 years, the following facts have been established by experimental operations.

1. The concentration of ice nuclei in the natural atmosphere upon which most precipitation depends has been found to vary by a factor of at least a millionfold.

2. It has been established experimentally that small amounts of silver iodide or dry ice may be used as nuclei or to generate nuclei to equal or exceed the concentration of

natural ice nuclei. In addition to this control of concentration by artificial means, the two substances mentioned are effective at temperatures considerably warmer than those produced by natural causes.

3. As the result of many hundreds of experiments with natural supercooled clouds in the free atmosphere, on mountains, and as ground fogs, it is an established fact that all such supercooled clouds may be artificially modified, the speed of modification depending on concentration of nuclei, air temperature, and the method of distribution of the seeding agent.

4. Under special conditions of supersaturation, snow areas may be produced in air which previously was free of visible clouds.

5. Solid overcasts of supercooled clouds have been (a) made more persistent by over-seeding and (b) have been dissipated by the introduction of optimum concentrations of ice nuclei.

6. Intense local rainstorms have been initiated by proper seeding techniques and strong evidence obtained that the precipitation resulting was directly related to the seeding operation.

7. Widespread modification of the weather pattern over much of the United States may have resulted from a systematic silver-iodide seeding operation conducted during the past year in New Mexico.

8. Studies of many types of violent storms such as produce lightning, hail, torrential rain, high winds, and similar destructive phenomena show that practically all of them during their formative periods contain large amounts of supercooled cloud masses. There is considerable evidence that much of the storm's intensity depends on the degree of instability which develops as supercooling and that the violence of the storm is due to the sudden development of ice crystals in the unstable cloud due to a chain reaction mechanism.

It is not uncommon, particularly in the western part of the United States, for large cumulus cloud masses to be so deficient in ice nuclei that they reach altitudes so high that ice crystals form spontaneously (Ca 34,000' M. S. L., -39° C.). When this occurs the crystals are rarely larger than the original cloud droplets and thus do not fall back into the lower portion of the cloud to cause a seeding effect. As a result large masses of condensed water are carried to such high altitude that it is unlikely to become available as precipitation. It is probable that such loss of effective precipitation can be prevented by proper seeding techniques.

EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9780) providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

W. STUART SYMINGTON, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD—ARTICLE FROM THE READER'S DIGEST

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record, an article

entitled "Symington: Boss of the Home Front," published in the Reader's Digest for December 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD REFUTES THOSE PROFESSING FEAR OF REPUBLICAN ISOLATIONISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE PRESS-TELEGRAM, OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Record Refutes Those Professing Fear of Republican Isolationism," published in the Press-Telegram, of Long Beach, Calif., of November 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO DEALS IN KOREA—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Save Our Troops! No Deals in Korea, No Appeasement!" published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL MATURITY—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "National Maturity," written by John Hanna and published in the New York Herald Tribune of November 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE CANNOT SUPPORT OR FIGHT THE WHOLE WORLD—EDITORIAL FROM TOPEKA STATE JOURNAL

[Mr. SCHOEPPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Let's Quit Playing Atlas," published in the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal of December 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GRAVITY OF THE KOREAN DISPUTE—EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Let's End Korean Dispute Before the Entire World Is Afame With Terrible War," written by Fred C. Christopherson and published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader of December 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR MERCHANT MARINE FOR DEFENSE—EDITORIAL FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Our Merchant Marine for Defense," published in the Los Angeles Times of Saturday, November 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS, NURSES, AND MEDICAL TECHNICIANS—ARTICLE IN COLLIER'S

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an advertisement of an article in Collier's regarding the shortage of doctors, nurses, and medical technicians for the armed services, published in the Washington Post December 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM HARVEY RIFFEY, A CONFEDERATE SOLDIER, BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a tribute to a Confederate soldier by Senator ROBERTSON, delivered on February 15, 1941, at the funeral of William Harvey Riffe, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECLAMATION-PARK SERVICE SQUABBLE—ARTICLE BY G. E. UNTERMANN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "The Reclamation-Park Service Squabble," written by G. E. Untermann, which appears in the Appendix.]

IS GOP STRENGTH SIGN OF ISOLATIONISM?—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVO DAILY HERALD

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Is GOP Strength Sign of Isolationism?" published in the Provo (Utah) Daily Herald, November 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMBATING CRIME IN 1950—ADDRESS BY HON. DELESSEPS MORRISON

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Hon. deLesseps Morrison, mayor of New Orleans, La., before the American Municipal Congress in Washington, D. C., December 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is entitled to the floor if he desires it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he begins his speech?

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on page 16261 of the Record, at the head of the last column, my remarks read as follows:

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should first like to read the names which appear on the letter. They are:

"Jonas A. McBride, vice president, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; W. D. Johnson, vice president, national legislative representative, Order of Railway Conductors; Harry See, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen."

That means, Mr. President, that all the railroad organizations are now supporting and urging the passage of the bill and the amendment. The amendment carries out the intent of the committee amendment. The amendment before us simply spells out the purposes in greater detail. The only ones who are not urging the passage of the bill are the members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. They are not opposing it. The chief of the brotherhood feels that in view of past action he is not now in a position to endorse the bill. However, he is not opposed to its passage.

I should like to correct that statement. I have before me a letter from Mr. John

T. Corbett, assistant grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, addressed to me under date of today, and reading as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF
LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., December 8, 1950.
Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At page 16261 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 7, 1950, you are quoted as stating "that means, Mr. President, that all of the railroad organizations are now supporting and urging the passage of the bill and the amendments."

It appears proper to inform you that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers has been and continues to be opposed to the original bills, S. 3295 and H. R. 7789, and all of the amendments which have been proposed. Under these conditions it is requested that you correct your statement of December 7, 1950.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. CORBETT,
A. G. C. E.-N. L. E.

I am very happy to make that correction.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, for the benefit of Senators who have just come into the Chamber, I want to say that the Senator from Alabama has just placed in the RECORD a letter which he received this morning from Mr. John T. Corbett, the assistant grand chief engineer and the national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, asking the Senator from Alabama to correct an impression which might have been given from something he stated yesterday that could have indicated that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers was not opposing this particular legislation. To the contrary, that letter shows that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is unyieldingly opposed to this legislation. To make that point completely clear, with the consent of the Senator from Alabama I should like to read into the record at this time the copy of another letter sent to the Senator from Alabama this morning by Mr. Corbett which goes in more detail into the reasons why the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers feels that the passage of the pending bill would be nothing more nor less than its death knell. The letter is dated December 8, addressed to "Honorable LISTER HILL, United States Senator," is signed by Mr. John T. Corbett, who, as I just stated, is assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: At page 16268 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 7, 1950, in answer to an inquiry made by Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, you endeavor to justify the provisions of bill S. 3295 and the amendments which had previously been accepted by explaining that the individual employee in dual service as fireman and engineer would not be required to join but one labor organization.

It appears proper to inform you that there is no similar condition in any industry affecting the employees of the industry which has ever been given consideration that presents a greater injustice to the senior group of workers than your attempts.

You must understand that what you are explaining is that the apprentice is pro-

vided a guarantee or assurance that he shall never be required to secure membership in the senior organization which his apprenticeship prompts him to endeavor to secure promotion to.

This is an injustice to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers which could never be overcome.

Signed by Mr. John T. Corbett.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I have just come from a conference with Mr. Corbett, and if I ever met a gentleman who commands respect and who at the same time shows a completely unyielding determination on the part of the organization which he represents to adhere to a policy adopted in their conventions, and supported by their officials and their members, such a man is Mr. Corbett, who restated and adhered to that policy in the course of that conference. He explained to me that the firemen are entitled to membership in their union immediately upon their employment or shortly thereafter, but that they are not entitled to admission into the engineers' union until they acquire that higher status; that the effect of this particular provision would be to make it impossible for the engineers to have any real inducement to hold out to firemen or to gain from the firemen's membership the additions to their own membership which have come normally and in orderly fashion during the years of their respective organizations, but would, instead, mean that in advance the junior organization is notified that membership in its organization takes the place of, substitutes for, and is completely acceptable under the law in place of membership in the engineers' organization. He asked me to say to the Senate that his organization, by official national action, is unyieldingly opposed to this proposed legislation, and that they feel that it will mean that the death knell of their organization is being sounded when this particular legislation is placed in effect.

I also talked with another gentleman, whose name I am not free to give, who feels that the same situation applies with reference to the conductors, and he is completely at a loss to understand why any official of the conductors' brotherhood would have been willing to sign the letter and the statement which was placed in the RECORD yesterday afternoon. I do not make that statement as of my own knowledge, because I am not sufficiently familiar with the overlapping setup between the conductors' brotherhood and the more junior organizations from which they draw their membership. But it was the statement of this other gentleman, whom unfortunately I am not free to name, but who I think understands the situation, that the conductors would be in exactly the same difficulty as the engineers under the proposed legislation.

I call that to the attention of Senators who may be much more familiar with the situation than am I, simply as something that has come to me this morning which I feel should be passed on to the Senate, at least for investigation.

I also call the attention of the Senate at this time to the fact that after the Senate had laid aside this proposed legislation, after we had every right to be-

lieve it would not come up, after the crucial situation in our own domestic and the world affairs would appear to have guaranteed that, before controversial measures would be taken up, we would at least have the chance to pass upon some of the weighty national and international problems which confront us, this measure was called up unexpectedly. As the result of that, several Senators who, I understand, are unalterably opposed to this measure, are away, including the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOER], whom I mentioned yesterday. I understand the same statement applies to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], though I have not heard directly from him on that score, and to other Senators.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not quite understand why the Senator should say this measure was called up unexpectedly. It was on a motion of the Senator from Florida that consideration of this measure was postponed until November 27, which was the first day of the convening of the present short session. Then this measure was made either the pending business or was temporarily set aside from time to time, until finally we took up the rent-control joint resolution, and even at that time the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, asked consent that this bill be temporarily laid aside in order that we might proceed to consideration of the rent-control joint resolution. That would have meant, of course, that, as soon as the rent-control measure was completed, this bill would automatically come before the Senate as the unfinished business.

It happened that that request by the Senator from Illinois was objected to, and under the circumstances the Senator from Illinois felt compelled to make a motion to take up the rent-control measure, because it was a war measure. That motion, of course, prevailed. But there was never any intention or thought other than that the Senate would proceed to consider the railway labor bill just as soon as possible following the passage of the rent-control measure, on the motion of the Senator from Florida himself to make this bill the unfinished business on November 27.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not, of course, attempt to deny anything that has been said by the Senator from Alabama except to call attention to the fact that the majority leader himself several days ago spoke of the fact that a FEPC amendment had been proposed and that it had been stated such would be offered to this railway bill, and I understand it would still be offered if the Senator who favors offering it were present. He cannot be here until Monday. I heard, and I think I heard clearly, the majority leader state that it was useless to take up either the statehood bill or the Railway Labor Act, because the FEPC question had been injected as to both of them and, therefore, he was going to proceed to other measures.

I simply call the Senate's attention to the fact that that statement was undoubtedly made on the floor of the Senate, and the reason I recall it so well is because the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, limited his statement to FEPC and its disturbing effect on those two measures, that is, the statehood measure and the Railway Labor Act.

The Senator from Florida, recalling that he had had something to say in the same field of civil-rights legislation at the time he placed in the RECORD the outstanding remarks made by Mr. James A. Farley in addressing the State Chamber of Commerce of Florida at Tampa, and recalling that those remarks included a very strong statement of the convictions of Mr. Farley that it was all wrong to bring up civil-rights legislation; that the problems were being solved peacefully and quickly in the South at present; and he even requested the President and the leadership to adopt a different policy, that is, of calling in the governors of the States which were affected to see if some State or regional plan could not be launched to hurry up the efforts for a peaceful solution which were already under way. So I brought that matter into the RECORD at that time.

I remember perfectly well, and I state it here as a matter of fact, that the majority leader did state at that time that it was perfectly apparent that the injection of the FEPC question had made it impossible to go ahead with the statehood bill and also with the amendments to the Railway Labor Act. That being the case, I think it was completely justifiable for those of us who had their doubts about this particular measure to feel that it had been laid aside for the duration of this particular short session.

However, be that as it may, the reason why I have mentioned that situation is that I wish to call attention to the fact that we have this measure dumped into our laps at a time when critical national and international questions are pending, and when some of the measures incident thereto should be ready—as I believe some of them are—for consideration by the Senate. If I understood correctly the statement made yesterday by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, it was that his committee had completed action the day before on the measure authorizing aid to Yugoslavia because of the long drought there. Certainly we could be considering that measure at this time. However, on the contrary, we have been asked—unexpectedly, I repeat—to take up this measure proposing amendments to the Railway Labor Act.

Then, to make bad matters worse—and I address this statement particularly to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and I appeal to his good, sound judgment—the Members of the Senate had no notice, until this debate started, of the fact that there was to be voted into the bill an amendment of a type which would make membership in one union among the operating brotherhoods sufficient. Incidentally, that point is the one which is behind the strong complaint coming now from the official representatives of the Brotherhood of

Locomotive Engineers, to the effect that this measure, as amended yesterday—not in its original form, but as it was amended yesterday, and solely because of that amendment—would, in effect, put their organization out of existence.

Mr. President, to my mind it is all wrong to bring forward this measure at this time, and particularly with amendments which completely change its application in important fields, amendments which, as stated here over the signature of Mr. Corbett, the high official of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, who is speaking for his organization, will in effect destroy that organization.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to repeat what I said yesterday, namely, there is no difference between the intent of the amendment reported by the committee and the intent of the amendment which the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio and I offered on yesterday, and which the Senate adopted.

So far as Mr. Corbett is concerned, he appeared at the hearings and opposed the bill at that time. He did so most vigorously. Of course he was entirely within his rights in doing that; but in view of that fact, there is nothing at all surprising about the letter Mr. Corbett has just written. If the Senator from Florida will examine the hearings and the testimony of Mr. Corbett before the subcommittee, the Senator will find that Mr. Corbett opposed the bill at that time, before the amendment adopted on yesterday was ever thought of. Mr. Corbett always has been in opposition to the bill; that is all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I repeat my statement that no Member of the Senate who was not familiar with the conferences which were going on and was not a part of those conferences, knew about the amendment which on yesterday was voted into the bill. Furthermore, that amendment is apparently the reason for the strong and unyielding position taken by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers this morning.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that insofar as Members of the Senate who are not on the committee are concerned, we had no information at all distinguishing the position of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers from the position of the other railroad brotherhoods until yesterday and until the putting into the RECORD of that letter, because Senators will recall that, when this matter was coming up in September, we received official communications of various types from the several brotherhoods, advising us that the brotherhoods as a group at that time were opposed to the bill in the form in which it was then drawn. Of course, as the Senator from Alabama himself said yesterday in offering the amendment, the amendment was responsible for the change in position of the operating brotherhoods the names of whose representatives were signed to the letter the Senator placed in the RECORD yesterday.

So I repeat my statement that yesterday we were confronted with an amendment which none of us had had a chance to see, an amendment of far-reaching import, an amendment which changed the situation with reference to the operating brotherhoods, so that apparently all of them but the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers have been willing to give their last-minute consent—whether wisely or otherwise, I do not know, and we had no possible advance notice upon that subject until the matter exploded in our faces yesterday.

Mr. President, I think it is highly unwise for the Senate to pass a far-reaching measure of this type at this time, in view of the present critical condition of the Nation, and when even now leading Members of the Senate are tied up in such important committees as the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, which are in session, and the Finance Committee, which I believe to be even now in session, for it was in session just before the session of the Senate began today, and also the Judiciary Committee. This morning I tried to contact certain members of that committee, but I found that they were at the session of the committee, considering the confirmation of a nomination which has to do directly with the defense effort. So I say that under these circumstances it is impossible for us to keep informed about such an important measure as this one, highly controversial and rapidly changing in nature, which was taken up unexpectedly yesterday, at least unexpectedly as to many Senators.

I say to the Senator that the motion made in September, leading up to the discussion on November 27, in respect to this measure, was made in completely different circumstances and before the Nation was in the situation it is in now. If the Senator will examine the RECORD, he will find that I had not a word of objection at the opening of this short session to the consideration of the measure then, because the situation had not even that late become so critical as it now is.

However, I am commenting quite in the open in criticism of the leadership, and of what seems to me most unwise leadership, for bringing up this measure at this time, at a time when the Senate cannot possibly advise itself as to what is going on, and particularly when we find proposed amendments which though brought in at the last minute, would bring about a sweeping change in the nature of the measure, and that change has produced the sterling letter—the one to which I referred a moment ago—which just this morning has come from Mr. Corbett to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

As I have said, the same point made by Mr. Corbett may apply to the railroad conductors also; and they, too, may be seriously jeopardized and perhaps wiped out by this measure, with the amendments which have been incorporated in it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In view of the matters referred to by the Senator from Florida and in view of the fact that the bill as now constituted does not recognize State constitutions or State statutes relating to the same subject, would it not be the better part of wisdom for the Senate to recommit the bill to the committee for further study at a time when the controversies and confusions as to who supports the bill and who does not support it can be looked into further, thus giving the masses of workers in those organizations some opportunity to know what effect the proposed legislation will have, before we enact it into law?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator has a good point. The conflicts of thinking arising from the amendments placed in the bill just yesterday, and communicated to the public just yesterday, bear out particularly the wisdom of the course of recommitment suggested by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

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

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am not very familiar with the provisions of the pending bill, but I am under the impression that the bill, unless it is very materially amended, would put a great handicap upon any State control whatever.

Has the Senator from Florida studied that phase of the bill, and can he give us some information as to what the bill, unless it is further amended, would do to our State regulatory bodies, especially those regulating public utilities?

In Virginia we have a law to the effect that the State can prevent a strike in a utility if such a strike would result in the destruction or disruption of essential services, and then the State can temporarily take charge of the utility and can work out some plan. I do not know the effect this measure, if enacted, would have upon State control, but I have been told that the bill does not carry the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in that respect.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the question the Senator from Virginia has asked. I shall endeavor to give an answer which will be as brief as possible, although it will take a little time to answer the question.

In the first place, the Senator from Virginia is completely correct in his understanding of the fact that, notwithstanding that general statements to the contrary have been made, this bill does not include the full provision of the Taft-Hartley Act referring to the union shop. This bill leaves out, purposely, the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which protects, preserves, and recognizes the provisions of State laws in some 18 or 20 States—some by constitutional provision, some by statutory provision, some by both—which set up a requirement that there may never be imposed within those States and within their jurisdiction a condition for employment of one of their worthy citizens based upon either membership or nonmembership in a union.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may complete this part of my statement, I shall then be glad to yield.

The Senator from Virginia will recall that not only was that provision included by the Senate, as a result of a substantial vote in the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill, and made a condition to its passage, but that in all the debates for repeal and for amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act the same position was taken. I am able to say to the Senator authoritatively that the last time this question was debated by the Senate—this same body—last year, the Senate voted 53 to 41 to insist upon retention of that provision; 94 Members of the Senate being present, and the only other Member of the then Senate, because we had only 95 Members at the time—who was unfortunately and unavoidably absent, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] indicated his stand as being with the 53. In other words, the position of the Senate at that time was really 54 to 41 for continuance of the requirement that there must be recognition given to the State laws, whether constitutional or statutory.

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

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator knows that primarily in our thinking and in our hearts there is concern over the war situation. This morning, at the request of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I asked and obtained permission for his committee to be in session this afternoon while the Senate is in session. The President has very properly urged us to increase taxation. I made several speeches last fall saying we ought to have \$10,000,000,000 of new taxation, because we were going to have to spend far in excess of that amount. We have pending a tax bill which the House said would raise \$3,400,000,000, but we have not completed action on it. The Armed Services Committee is in session, and its members are not here. The Appropriations Committee is asked to report about \$18,000,000,000 of new items. We have a minimum attendance on the Senate floor, and there will not be many more Senators here for the remainder of this debate.

Does the distinguished Senator from Florida, considering its importance, see some way by which we may postpone the vote upon the pending measure until the membership can become better informed upon the real issues confronting us?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator knows, of course, that any Senator may move to recommit the bill or to postpone action until a fixed date. No such motion has been made up to this time.

To complete my answer to the Senator's question, I desire to call his attention to something which was brought out clearly yesterday afternoon, time after time, namely, that the passage of this bill in its present form would be

nothing but an open invitation to, and I may say almost an assurance of, the early amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act so as to exclude the present provision recognizing and protecting the States who have voted constitutionally or by statute banning the closed shop or union shop.

Mr. McCLELLAN rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. To make that point completely clear, before yielding to the Senator from Arkansas, I desire to remind Senators that while the measure which is now pending affects two branches of labor, namely, railway transportation and aviation transportation, the Taft-Hartley Act, containing requirements which recognize and respect State laws, affects other branches of transportation which are directly competitive, such as the motortruck-transportation industry, which has become one of the largest factors in interstate transportation, and such as maritime transportation. My understanding is that all the maritime organizations are under the Taft-Hartley Act. If that understanding is incorrect, it at least came from legal counsel for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this morning in response to a direct inquiry. I observe the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] apparently confirming that statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think that is correct, and, if the Senator will yield, is it not an argument for giving railway labor the same sort of law which the Taft-Hartley Act extends to the other branches of labor? It seems to me that when we analyze the labor of the entire country, and realize that competing organizations have rights to the union shop, that it is, though perhaps not wrong, at least a little bit unfair to decide that the railway labor shall not enjoy the privilege—because it is a privilege from the standpoint of organization—which nearly all other labor enjoys?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Utah, and I would give them much greater force if the pending measure extended to the railway workers and the aviation workers exactly the same kind of provisions as those which are contained in the Taft-Hartley Act. But the Senator well knows that the Taft-Hartley Act includes a provision which protects, respects, and preserves the rights of the States which have acted in this field, whereas the pending legislation definitely declines to do that and deliberately proposes to set up a new sort of union shop under which the State laws will not be respected.

I further call to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact that in another very vital particular he is not proposing to put workers in the railway industry and the aviation industry on a parity with the workers in other transportation industries covered by the Taft-Hartley Act, in that, under this proposed amendment, he would still retain in the Railway Labor Act freedom from use of the injunction to protect the public in the event of threatened collapse of these two transportation systems, whereas, as to all vital national industries covered

by the Taft-Hartley Act—including, of course, the maritime industry, in which the injunction has already been used, as I recall, three times—there is provision that the injunction can be used to protect the public interest throughout the Nation.

If the Senator from Utah wishes to do what he is really suggesting by his question, then he should propose a measure which would attempt to put and which would offer to put the railway industry and aviation industry on a parity, with equal and identical treatment, with workers in other vital industries covered by the Taft-Hartley Act. But the question which the Senator from Utah has now posed is not in my judgment soundly posed, because the measure which we are now debating does not even pretend to place workers in the railroad and aviation industries upon the same basis with workers in other transportation industries which are covered by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. THOMAS of Utah rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. Permit me to yield again to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In this little discussion I think we ought not lose sight of the fact that the pending measure is in the nature of an amendment to another very extensive law which governs and controls the railway industry of the country. I may say that while, of course, no one should ever speculate about a law or about the future decision of a court, I think the very things for which the Senator from Florida is contending are better protected by the amendment as it is now before the Senate than it would be if we were to put the provision of the Taft-Hartley law into this measure. I say that for this reason—and it is not a legal reason; it is a sentimental reason, because, I repeat, no one can predict what the courts are going to do—but the fact remains that in the history of the United States, so far as railway law is concerned and so far as railway ideas are concerned, the one thing above all others as to which there is supremacy of Federal law, as a result of the way in which the courts have acted, is the field of railway labor.

If, for example—and this is merely an example—someone opposed to this bill were also opposed to the railway law, to the Taft-Hartley law, and to the protection which the Taft-Hartley law gives to the various States in the matter of their fundamental laws in regard to labor organizations, and wanted to challenge this provision as being probably unconstitutional, because it interferes with the supremacies already recognized by hundreds and hundreds of decisions, he could readily argue that the court would likely hand down a decision favoring the contention that this provision has no place in the pending measure because it challenges the supremacy of the Federal Government in this great field.

When that was done, the next natural move by any lawyer who is thinking in terms of what is in the best interest of

his clients would be to challenge the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. At the present time those provisions are not challenged. They are not challenged for the simple reason that labor within the United States is exceedingly complex and labor laws in 18 of our States are also exceedingly complex.

Furthermore, we find that where happy industry-labor relations exist in a given State, they like the status quo as it is; but I think, speaking sentimentally, the Senator from Florida could not do a more unwise thing than to inject an invitation for a challenge to what the Congress of the United States is doing in regard to the relations between State law and Federal law. It should be realized that the National Labor Relations Act which brought about a new definition by Congress, and which brought into existence Federal activity in a field which the Federal Government had not heretofore entered, is but a little over 10 years old. There is no doubt plenty of room for further challenge. Any law in the United States which becomes worth while becomes so through practice, through becoming recognized as the customary law, under which we learn how to do things. When we upset such laws, we do violence to the understandings which our people have, which have kept us a very peaceful country compared with certain other countries of the world.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah, for whom I have always had deep respect. Since he has directed his remarks almost entirely to his statement that railroad labor treatment should be separate and different because Federal jurisdiction over the railroads has been very generally recognized, I should like to recall to him that there are various industries, all covered by the Taft-Hartley Act, which are exclusively within Federal control. For instance, I mention the radio and television industries and the organizations of workmen in those two great industries. They are entirely covered by the Taft-Hartley law. Control of those industries is almost completely under Federal law.

The point I am making is that in legislation affecting those industries, as well as many other industries which I could mention, the various State laws are respected. It seems to me, as it seems to many other Senators, that there is as much reason, right, and justice in the recognition of the force and effect of State laws as applicable to those engaged in the railroad industry or in the aviation industry, and dwelling within the jurisdiction of the States which have such laws, as there is in the case of the motortruck-transportation industry or the maritime-transportation industry, both of which are covered by the Taft-Hartley law. The same statement can be made as to the radio industry and to the television industry, both of which operate entirely under the Taft-Hartley law. The same can be said of the oil and gas-pipeline industry, which operates largely under the Taft-Hartley law, or of the telephone and telegraph industries, which of course operate so largely in the field of interstate com-

merce. All those activities are included within the purview and scope of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The point that I started to make is, I believe, sound—and I have not heard the distinguished Senator from Utah assail it, except upon what he has frankly stated to be sentimental grounds—namely, that the railway and aviation industry covered by this law should not be under such a setup as would compel respect of State laws, whereas two directly competing industries, the maritime industry, which includes internal as well as external shipping by water, and the motortruck transportation industry are included under the Taft-Hartley law, and must respect the State laws. I have not heard either of the industries complaining about that fact or of having been adversely affected because of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have promised to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wish to say that the answer of the distinguished Senator from Florida to the able Senator from Utah further emphasizes the view which I expressed a few moments ago, namely, that no emergency exists which compels action on the pending bill at this time. Certainly there is much confusion about it. Also involved is the issue of whether or not we are to begin tearing down the Taft-Hartley law with relation to respecting State constitutions and State laws in this field, and thereby extending to this particular class of labor a privilege which is denied to other labor engaged in comparable and in some cases the same character of interstate commerce.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator's observation is completely sound and eminently correct.

Mr. President, there was another matter which came up this morning. It was brought to the attention of my office by people who are directly concerned with the question. I have addressed a question under it to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. PEPPER], and the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I believe that, like myself, they are unable to give a categorical answer to the problem which I shall mention. It is a problem which is already causing concern among some railway labor people. The matter is new to me. I had no prior knowledge of it. It seems that there is a CIO union which is called, I believe, the Transport Workers Union, which covers all levels of railway transportation employees, from maintenance-of-way men up to and including the engineers and conductors, or whoever would be termed as being in the most senior groups of employment. The information coming to me is that there is a considerable number—I am sorry I cannot give the exact number—of employees of railroads who happen to be engineers, or conductors, or firemen, or others in the same fields as are covered by the operating brotherhoods, as well as in fields covered by the nonoperating brotherhoods, who hold membership in this particular CIO union. I am sorry I

cannot speak more specifically as to the number of employees involved or as to the distribution of the membership of this union. However, it is a question which came to my attention only a few minutes before debate started this afternoon. I am reporting the information to the Senate because it is worthy of very full and careful consideration.

The question is: Does the amendment adopted yesterday protect from the provisions of the pending bill members of that CIO union who are in the same classifications of employment which are covered by the operating brotherhoods, that is, engineers, conductors, firemen, trainmen, and the like? If enacted into law this bill, with the amendment, would, apparently, force such members of this CIO union into craft unions, or at least into one such union. I am certain that no one supporting the amendment had any such intention in mind.

All I can say is that, in asking the question this morning, I have not been able to receive any authoritative answer. Therefore I bring the question to the floor of the Senate for consideration. It is a fact that such a transportation union does exist, and that it is a CIO union, which covers all levels of employment among railroad employees. It is likewise a fact that most of the nonoperating unions in the railway setup are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and that the brotherhoods in the operating levels of employment are independent and not affiliated with either. Therefore the question is whether or not the CIO union, which is not a craft union at all, is protected, and whether or not its members in the fields covered by the operating brotherhoods are protected by the amendment which was adopted yesterday, and which, apparently, is confined in its effect to craft union membership.

I would greatly appreciate an answer to the question, and at this time I ask that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. PEPPER], and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who, I believe, has stepped out of the Chamber at the moment, give specific consideration to that question in the addresses which they will make today. I am putting forth the question as one which was brought to my attention rather forcefully by some people who would be affected by the pending legislation. They have grave doubts as to whether members of this CIO union who are in the operating classifications of employment, are protected under the amendment adopted yesterday. They have the further question in their minds as to whether or not the amendment and the bill, if passed, could afford encouragement and incentive to the organization of several CIO unions in the various fields now covered by the nonoperating unions which have affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. It can be seen that we are faced by a very practical question, the answer to which someone ought to think through, but which, so far as my inquiry has gone, has not been thought through by anyone.

I put forth the question with the hope that members of the committee, who certainly are better informed than other Members of the Senate can be informed, may enlighten the Senate in the remaining hours of debate as to what the effect of the proposed law, as amended, would be upon the members of the present existing CIO union in this field, as well as what its effect would be upon inviting further organization of CIO unions in nonoperating crafts, which are now organized on a craft basis but are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. President, last evening I gave notice that about all I would want to do today would be to give a brief résumé of what I had said yesterday. I hoped that Senators would be present who were not here yesterday. I am gratified to see that some such Senators are present. I am pleased to know that they were able to come. I appreciate their coming and joining in the debate. I had hoped that more Senators would be able to come and join in the debate. I am sure they would be here but for the fact that critical matters of international and national importance are pending, with respect to which Senators must attend meetings of committees.

Mr. President, I think it is decidedly unwise to jump into this particular legislation without knowing what it is all about. I want to say that, in my humble judgment, there is not a Senator on the floor today who knows exactly what the proposed legislation, as now amended, means.

Mr. President, in closing I should like to give a brief résumé of my amendment. It simply provides that the same wording which is used and is now a part of the Taft-Hartley law, by which respect, confirmation, and enforcement is given to constitutional and statutory provisions of some 18 or 20 States, which States have seen fit in their sovereign judgment to impose conditions under which it can never be required of a worker within those States that he must be a member of a union or be a nonmember before he is entitled to employment, shall be incorporated into the pending measure before it is enacted into law. The reason for my amendment is not only consistency, not only because, if the State laws are entitled to respect and protection in other fields, they are in this; but particularly because the Taft-Hartley Act applies to industries which are directly competing with those which are covered by the pending bill. The bill covers railroads and aviation, and only those. The Taft-Hartley law covers maritime or water transportation and motortruck transportation. There can be no successful denial of the fact that those industries are in direct competition with the railroads and with aviation. There can be no successful denial of the fact that they are crossing State lines just as often, and with just as large a proportion of their employees, as is true in the case of railroads or aviation.

I repeat what I said yesterday. I think it is true—although I have not the figures to substantiate it—that in the motortruck industry a larger percentage of the

employees actually do cross State lines in the performance of their employment than is true in the case of railway employees, or in the case of aviation. Senators know of the enormous force of skilled employees required on the ground at fixed locations to keep the planes flying. Many Senators know of their own knowledge, as I know of my own knowledge, of the very much larger numbers of mechanics, clerical employees, and all sorts of settled employees located at one position in one State, which are found in the aviation industry, as compared with those of lesser number who are employed in the actual operation or servicing in the air of the planes of any particular airline. There is no question that only a small percentage of the employees of aviation are actually crossing State lines from day to day, or as a feature of their employment.

Not only are there competing industries in this field, but I call attention again to the fact that many other industries which are, in the major part of their operations and in their major aspect, interstate, are also covered by the Taft-Hartley Act, under which State laws in this field are respected. I mentioned telephones, telegraph, and others. Many others will occur to Senators. I mentioned also a group of industries which exist and function solely under Federal law, which are covered by the Taft-Hartley Act, which respects the State laws in their application to employees of this latest class of industries, such as radio, television, and interstate oil- and gas-transportation pipelines.

Mr. President, it is wise for us to pass this proposed legislation, freed from the respect given by the Taft-Hartley Act to the State laws, realizing and knowing that to do so will simply be to extend an open invitation, and almost to give assurance that we expect shortly, as quickly as the matter can be considered, to pass upon a similar proposal taking out of the Taft-Hartley Act the respect now given under that act to State law as it affects motor transportation, as it affects maritime transportation, and as it affects television, radio, oil- and gas-transportation lines, telegraph, telephone, and any number of other industries which will occur to Senators?

If Senators want to vote for this bill, that is, of course, their privilege and right. Some eminent Senators will vote for it, because there were some eminent Senators who did not want these provisions respecting the State law in the Taft-Hartley Act. But I do not believe that any Senator, regardless of his attitude on that point, can possibly vote for this measure without realizing that if it passes it almost dooms, by its passage, that part of the Taft-Hartley law respecting State laws which has been so carefully insisted upon at all stages of its enactment, and which respects State constitutions and State laws in 18 or 20 States which have seen fit in their sovereign judgment to impose State laws covering labor and employment conditions in those States and imposing as a condition that a man shall be free to work, to be employed, and continue in

employment regardless of whether he is a union member or not. If we vote for this measure, let us do it with eyes wide open, realizing that it is an indirect assault upon those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to which I have referred. It cannot be construed in any other way.

It is not remarkable that almost all of the Senators who are fighting so hard for this act, and particularly against the amendment which the Senator from Florida has proposed, to incorporate into the act the same words now in the Taft-Hartley Act, giving respect and recognition to State laws, are the same Senators who so strongly resisted the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law and who never favored the incorporation into the Taft-Hartley law of the provisions which respect and preserve State laws.

They are completely consistent in the reassertion of their point of view in the pending bill, but I am wondering whether it is at all consistent for the considerable majority of the Senate who have taken exactly the opposite position, and who have insisted, every time the question has been raised, upon incorporating in the Taft-Hartley law provisions with respect to sustaining State laws. Is it consistent upon the part of those of us who took such position to support this pending bill, free from the incorporation in it of the provision which I am offering, which would make this bill, in this respect, at least, exactly like the Taft-Hartley law, that is, in the respect that it would give recognition to State laws of the type to which I have just referred?

Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks upon this subject. I feel keenly on it, because I think there should be some uniformity in Federal legislation affecting similar fields. I believe that, above all things, the States do have some rights in this matter. They have gone to great lengths to assert those rights. They have set them up in many cases under constitutional enactments. Before those constitutional enactments could go to the people for approval they had to be approved by the legislative bodies of those States, generally by much more than a simple majority of the membership of the two Houses, or, in the case of Nebraska, of the one house of the State legislature. Then the people themselves have adopted the constitutional provisions by their votes, and in our State at least it was by a most substantial vote. In other States, where I have seen the returns, the same result was reached, expressing the verdict of the people in this important, vital matter.

Following the adoption of constitutional provisions, there have been legislative enactments in many States of enabling laws to carry out the provisions of the constitutional amendments. The junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] yesterday, in his colloquy, brought out that in the State of Nebraska enabling acts had to be enacted, and they were enacted by subsequent legislatures succeeding the legislatures which submitted the amendments, and there were three amendments of that kind—amendments known as sections 13, 14, and 15 of the State Constitution of Nebraska.

I am sure that there have been experiences in other States similar to that experienced in our State. Since the enactment of these constitutional provisions, or since the enactment of the rule by statute in those States which have gone into this field by constitutional enactment, there have been repeated efforts to repeal, and those efforts at repeal have failed. In my State, at each session of the legislature since 1944, when the constitutional amendment was approved, proposed constitutional amendments to repeal that constitutional amendment have been offered and rejected.

In the States with which I am most familiar—for instance, in the State of North Carolina—I know of my own knowledge repeal measures have been offered in the legislatures, and I see my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], nodding his head in affirmation of the statement. I do not know how many there have been, or in how many legislatures, but there have been measures offered to repeal the State statutes which provided that, as a condition of employment in any industry in the State, membership or nonmembership in a union might never be used to bar a citizen of the State from gainful employment. I assume that has been the situation in every State where the matter has come up. It has been a dignified question, handled in the most thoroughly democratic fashion. It is not a question for any individual to cavil about, as to whether he approves the enactment in his particular State or not. It is a question for those States where there are constitutional provisions of this kind, which has been decided by the people themselves, and has been placed into the fundamental law of the State which governs all of the citizens in those States.

As to the States where statutory enactments have taken place, almost the same dignity applies, because there have been frequent opportunities since the original enactment to change that declaration of State policy, and such opportunities have brought about battles in the races for the State legislature. Those battles have so terminated that the legislatures subsequent to the enactment of the anti-closed-shop rules and the anti-union-shop rules by statute have not repealed those enactments, but instead have refused to do so.

It comes down solely—as it was last year when we debated it—to the question of what is sound public policy in such a matter. I respectfully invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that on the same question, fully debated last year, in a vote participated in by 94 of the then 95 Members of the United States Senate, the majority was 53 to 41 for the retention in the Taft-Hartley Act of the provisions of that act which respect and recognize and confirm State laws in this field.

I say again that the only other Member of the then Senate who could not be present, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made it very clear in the RECORD that he took his stand with the 53. So the entire membership of the Senate then was divided 54 to 41 in favor

of the philosophy under which States' rights are recognized in this field. Why should they not be recognized? They should be recognized, because the State laws have to do with the modus vivendi, with the way of living, with the way of seeking and gaining and continuing to hold employment, with the way of enabling citizens in those States to support their families, to sustain themselves and attain their ambitions by hard work. The issue runs to the very essence of democratic existence and opportunity.

These dignified statements of State policy should be recognized, and have been recognized in the past, and I hope with all my heart they will be recognized by the Senate today, in approving my amendment, thus seeing to it that this measure, if it becomes law, shall carry with it that same philosophy in the fields covered by the Railway Labor Act, which exists in all other fields of employment throughout the Nation, and that the States' declarations on this subject shall be respected, confirmed, observed, and enforced.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am intensely interested in what the distinguished Senator from Florida has had to say with reference to the position of States who in their wisdom have, through their legislative assemblies, passed certain types of labor legislation. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that the State of Kansas, at a time when the present speaker, the junior Senator from Kansas, was Governor of the State, through the wisdom of its legislature, placed upon the statute books a labor law. That law may not have been perfect, but it was tested in the courts to a degree, and the decisions following those testing processes, of course, speak for themselves.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Florida and to the Members of the Senate who are now in the Senate Chamber, that the Senator from Kansas feels that if the proposed legislation were to be enacted without the safeguarding amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Florida respecting the State laws and the State responsibilities as the legislatures of the States saw them at the time they enacted the State laws, I, coming from one of the States which have passed such laws, the State of Kansas, feel that I would be rather remiss in my responsibility and duty if I were not to point out that lack to the people of my State and to the people of some of the other States who are in similar position. If I were not to point out that situation I feel I would not be fully representing the people of my State in their wishes and desires as they are now and as they were when the State laws were passed.

Mr. President, I should like to say further, that, while I am in favor of the measure generally as it is before the Senate, I am bound in due conscience and

in all respects as I see it, to support the position of the Senator from Florida respecting the laws of my State, which were placed on the statute books after most careful consideration, and especially in view of the fact that since the time of their enactment there have been in session successive legislatures which have not seen fit to override the laws in question in any material degree.

I feel I must say that the State of Kansas would, I am sure, expect me to protect its right to invoke and to maintain on the statute books the type of legislation it wanted at the time the laws were enacted, especially in view of the fact that it was not inconsistent or incompatible with the exercise of the right possessed by the various labor organizations and individuals in the protection of their privileges.

I thought the Senator from Florida should know that and I want him to know it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate deeply the expression of the Senator from Kansas. He is confronted with exactly the same dilemma which confronts the junior Senator from Florida, and which I am sure confronts many other Senators.

If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I desire to repeat an illustration of the situation which will result if the proposed law is enacted. In Miami, one of the finest communities in our State and in the Nation, there are very large aviation shops and offices, because Miami is one of the great aviation centers of the Nation. I have been told that there are from eight to ten thousand employees in those shops and offices. A large portion of the employees are mechanical employees in the gigantic shops which are located there. If the pending measure should be passed, those employees whose location is just as permanent and just as definite there as that of employees in the building trades and in many other branches of employment would be covered by this Railway Labor Act and would be exempted from the provisions of our State constitution. They would be living under a different law and with different rights and with different privileges in connection with the condition of their employment from thousands of employees in other substantial industries who live with them and around them, living together, as they do there, in the great city of Miami. To me that is a completely confusing and unsatisfactory situation, and I do not believe anyone who really looks at the question and weighs it would want that kind of condition to exist.

I repeat likewise, if I may, another thing which I stated yesterday to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. It seems to me that this is equally applicable to the two Senators from Kansas, who I am happy to see here in the Chamber. By the passage of the proposed legislation we would throw away, so far as our States are concerned, which have taken these State positions, three important vital values which now exist, and which I think they have a very great interest in

continuing. What are they? The first one is the value so ably stated by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL]. The legislature of his State has, in its wisdom, passed the law he mentioned. The law has been upheld by the State courts of Kansas. Its repeal has been refused by subsequent legislatures. It has become the settled policy and a part of the philosophy, a part of the thinking, a part of the standards of living in his great State. That value is jeopardized and will be destroyed as to many, many people living within his State by the enactment of the proposed legislation, if it be enacted.

Secondly, since the enactment of such legislation—not the particular statute in Kansas, or at least not that to my knowledge, but similar enactments—a similar statute enacted in the State of North Carolina and two similar constitutional measures enacted, one in Nebraska and one in Arizona, have come to the United States Supreme Court, have been argued at great length and fully before that Court, and that Court has in those three cases, by unusually unanimous decisions, 9 to 0 in two of the cases and 8 to 1 in the Arizona case, upheld the validity of those State measures. It has become to the good people of Kansas and to the good people of every State who have trod the same path, now a vested assurance that under Federal law, as interpreted by the highest court of the land, their State laws are valid, they are legal, they are constitutional when judged by Federal constitutional standards. And a court which is not noted for its unanimity or for its sameness of thinking, has in the North Carolina case and in the Nebraska case unanimously said, "Here was a valid enactment which the good people of North Carolina and the good people of Nebraska had the right to invoke upon themselves and the people dwelling within their limits if they choose to do so."

This second value would be destroyed and lost to many residents in each of the States who have taken action in this field, if the proposed legislation should be enacted. Many of the residents of those States would be jeopardized as to their standing in employment, because the Senator knows full well, for he is a practical man, that this is nothing but an entering wedge, it is so designed, and comes from those same sources who do not want any respect given to State law in this field, and have never wanted it given.

Thirdly, by the enactment of this bill the people of Kansas, the people of Florida, and the people of the other States mentioned will lose what they now have, or will be jeopardized in what they now have in all fields except these two—they will lose the assurance that their law will be respected, because we all know that we in the Congress have up to now recognized the validity of these State acts. The Senator from Kansas himself was one of those who so voted. The Senator from Florida was another. We recognized and charted the policy of the Congress of the United States by substantial majorities in 1947 and 1949. We thought that in this important question

of public policy the States should be allowed to say for themselves what they wanted in this particular field.

Passage of the proposed legislation would in the first place jeopardize everything that has gone before, because it would carry with it the immediate assurance that we are going to have an urgent request for other amendatory and weakening legislation.

Further, as to two great classes of citizens, employees of railroads and of the aviation industry, those States will lose the assurance that they have had under Federal law that those industries would be open shop. The Federal law has gone further heretofore in this field than have many of the State provisions.

So, Mr. President, not only are we asked to bring those industries out of the open-shop classification, as guaranteed under the Railway Labor Act, both in 1926 and in its reenactment in 1934 and in its text up to this very date, but we are asked to go from the complete open-shop extreme to another extreme which ignores and violates the declaration of Federal policy which has come out of this Congress with substantial majorities in both Houses behind it—they had to be substantial enough to override a Presidential veto in 1947; and we would be rejecting and withdrawing from a position which we have frequently maintained, and which we have stated, and restated and restated again, is a sound philosophy in this particular field. There is no doubt that the sacrifice of great rights by many States and their people is involved in this measure.

If the Senate had the time to leave its consideration of the present international matters and make a detailed study of this matter, and if the Senate had a chance to realize clearly that in this case we are being asked to make an about face in this particular field and to take a completely different position from the one we have taken in respect to all other fields of employment, I do not believe the Senate would even consider doing so.

To the contrary, I believe the Senate would be even more sturdy in taking the action I advocate than the Senate was in its last action in June 1949, when the membership was divided 54 to 41, as I said a moment ago, if it could have an opportunity to realize that the three values I have just recited will be jeopardized and lost to the people of 18 or 20 sovereign States if the Congress should hurriedly, and without the adoption of the necessary protective amendments, pass this measure.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from Florida recall the colloquy in the Senate which occurred yesterday, relative to the question asked by myself as to whether the measure now proposed, and as amended by the

distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], would supersede or override the present provisions of the Nebraska State Constitution, together with the enabling act which was enacted by the Nebraska Legislature in accordance with the statutory requirements?

The distinguished Senator replied that he felt there was no doubt that this measure would override that constitutional provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; in the case of employees of the railroads and employees in the aviation industry.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

I should like to ask this question of the distinguished Senator: In the amendment which was submitted yesterday by the Senator from Alabama and adopted by the Senate, largely without much explanation, I find the following in subsection (c), as I read it:

(c) The requirement of membership in a labor organization in an agreement made pursuant to subparagraph (a) shall be satisfied, as to both a present or future employee in engine, train, yard, or hostling service, that is, an employee engaged in any of the services or capacities covered in section 3, first (h) of this act—

I take it that is the Railway Labor Act under which we are operating at the present time.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I read further—

defining the jurisdictional scope of the first division of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, if said employee shall hold or acquire membership in any one of the labor organizations, national in scope, organized in accordance with this act and admitting to membership employees of a craft or class in any of said services; and no agreement made pursuant to subparagraph (b) shall provide for deductions from his wages for periodic dues, initiation fees, or assessments payable to any labor organization other than that in which he holds membership: *Provided, however*, That as to an employee in any of said services on a particular carrier at the effective date of any such agreement on a carrier, who is not a member of any one of the labor organizations, national in scope, organized in accordance with this act and admitting to membership employees of a craft or class in any of said services, such employee, as a condition of continuing his employment, may be required to become a member of the organization representing the craft in which he is employed on the effective date of the first agreement applicable to him: *Provided further*, That nothing herein or in any such agreement or agreements shall prevent an employee from changing membership from one organization to another organization admitting to membership employees of a craft or class in any of said services.

I have read that amendment as a premise to my question, which is as follows: If this measure is enacted, will it give to employers and employees the right, by means of collective bargaining, to set up a union-shop agreement?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is done, will there be a mandatory provision that a person who today might not be a member of such an organization, will be forced into one union organization?

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can state is my personal understanding, which is that

such a person will be forced into the organization which at that time represents that particular class or craft of employees.

However, on this point I should prefer to yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], to permit him to state his view of the matter. Perhaps he may have a different view. However, certainly what I have just stated is my view.

Mr. WHERRY. I am seeking light on this question, and I shall be glad to propound the question to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to my friend, the Senator from Alabama, to permit him to reply to the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I would say that if the bargaining unit representing a particular employee arrived at an agreement with management, under which in that particular craft there was to be a union shop, the employee would be required to join the union.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first instance.

Mr. HILL. Yes; in the first instance.

Mr. WHERRY. And the agreement thus made between the employees and the employer could provide for a union shop, could it not?

Mr. HILL. There is nothing in the statute which requires any agreement whatever, unless it is voluntarily arrived at, and is of their own free will and accord. If the employer and the employees, when sitting around a conference table and engaged in the collective-bargaining process, agree to have a union shop, such an agreement could become effective. However, nothing in this measure would require a union shop at all. A union shop would be entirely permissive.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, does the use of the word "may" in the connection mean that the union shop would not be mandatory, but would be permissive?

Mr. HILL. Yes; it would be permissive.

Mr. WHERRY. If the agreement between management and labor provided for a union shop, this measure would be a permissive statute, so far as it goes. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. However, if management and labor enter into a contract which includes a provision that there shall be a check-off system, and if the contract also provides that the employees shall follow the union requirements for membership, those provisions can be written into the final agreement, can they not?

Mr. HILL. The check-off is in a different position, in that if there is to be a checkoff, the individual employee himself must give written consent or written assignment for it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the present situation under the Taft-Hartley law, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. My further question is this: Today, are members of the rail-

road unions required to belong to such a union?

Mr. HILL. The very purpose of this measure is to remove from existing law the prohibition against the union shop.

Mr. WHERRY. So the present Railway Labor Act does not make it permissive; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The purpose of this measure is to give the permission.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the purpose, what does the Senator believe will be done? Frankly, does he believe that immediately there will be collective bargaining agreements which will require membership in such an organization?

Mr. HILL. Yes; to be perfectly frank about it, I would imagine that if this measure should be enacted into law, labor would seek to bargain with management to bring about union shop agreements. That is what I would think.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask this question: Suppose a man is a fireman on a railroad and is a member of the firemen's brotherhood, but temporarily is promoted to be engineer. I refer to the illustration the Senator gave last night in the course of his remarks, and to the point the Senator made in connection with membership in only one union. In view of that illustration, what is the situation under the present act?

Mr. HILL. At the present time the question of union membership does not arise, because the union shop is prohibited.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know what the unions do at the present time when an employee who is a fireman on one of the railroads and is a member of the Brotherhood of Firemen, temporarily is promoted to be engineer. In such a case, does that employee temporarily join the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and subsequently return to the Brotherhood of Firemen when he returns to his old job of fireman?

Mr. HILL. No, because at the present time there is no requirement at all that he join a union. So he can do whatever he wishes to do.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but I am asking about one who is already a member of the firemen's union which I think is the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, one of the Big Four brotherhoods.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take the case of a man who is in good standing as a member of that organization and who is promoted to the position of engineer, does he continue in the firemen's union, or does he automatically and voluntarily go into the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers? And then, when he is demoted, does he go back into the firemen's organization, or does he retain membership in both organizations?

Mr. HILL. No; I would say that today it would be a matter of his own choice, as it would be if the pending measure were passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, I desire to ask this question: Let us take the case of a man who is a fireman after the pending measure is passed, does he join the fire-

men's organization, and does it require him to remain in that organization? Would it prevent his changing to membership in the engineers' organization?

Mr. HILL. No; not at all. He moves up to the engineers' organization.

Mr. WHERRY. What if he is demoted to fireman?

Mr. HILL. If he is demoted, he can return to the firemen's organization.

Mr. WHERRY. He would be permitted to change back and forth, would he?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. If he changes back and forth from engineman to fireman, or vice versa, he can change his affiliation.

Mr. WHERRY. Would he be free to join the firemen's organization again, if he had taken his membership from that organization?

Mr. HILL. That would be up to him, as to whether he wanted to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand it is a voluntary proposition, as it is now; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to find how it would work out in practice, and whether this measure would impose additional requirements upon him.

Mr. HILL. Under this measure, if there were a collective-bargaining agreement he would have to belong to one or the other of those two organizations.

Mr. WHERRY. If he belonged to the firemen's organization, he would not be denied the right to belong to another organization, I know.

Mr. HILL. No; of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words is it not a fact that if he went into the firemen's organization, it would more or less militate against the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers?

Mr. HILL. No; not at all. If he became an engineer then I should say the engineers' organization would be happy and delighted to take him in as a member of their organization. The choice would be his.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy over the colloquy which has taken place, because it points up the statement made by Mr. John T. Corbett, assistant grand chief engineer and the national labor representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in a very strong letter to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], which I have read into the RECORD. Mr. Corbett advises the Senator from Alabama, among other things, as follows:

It appears proper to inform you that there is no similar condition in any industry affecting the employees of the industry which has ever been given consideration that presents a greater injustice to the senior group of workers than your attempts.

You must understand that what you are explaining is that the apprentice is provided a guaranty or assurance he shall never be required to secure membership in the senior organization which his apprenticeship prompts him to endeavor to secure promotion to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that I did not hear the reading of the letter. I have been occupied with certain other matters. I deeply appreciate

the information, but that raises the same issue which I have raised here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Corbett ends his letter with this additional sentence, which I should like to read, if the Senator will permit:

This is an injustice to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers which could never be overcome.

I believe that is a rather categorical answer to the questions propounded.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell me who signed that?

Mr. HOLLAND. The letter is signed by Mr. John T. Corbett, assistant grand engineer and national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, who is stationed permanently in Washington, representing his organization, and who speaks officially for them, and who describes himself to me—and I am sure he is completely true in what he has said—as having been for 40 years in that organization, having come from the Milwaukee Railroad, I understand. In an earlier colloquy, and, before the able Senator from Nebraska came in, I stated that from another source the suggestion was made to me that exactly the same problem confronts the conductors organization, and that the individual propounding this question to me says he cannot understand why or how anyone assuming to speak for the conductors could possibly have signed a consent to this legislation; that he did not believe it was clearly understood.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me, before he proceeds to something else?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I may say to my friend from Nebraska that the gravamen of this complaint is simply that Mr. Corbett, assistant grand chief engineer, contends that under the bill as now amended, if an employee is a member of the firemen's organization, he has a right to make his choice as to whether he will remain in that organization or whether he will move up to the engineers' organization. Mr. Corbett's complaint is that he is not forced, when he becomes an engineer, to surrender membership in the firemen's organization, and be forced by law to go into the engineers' union. That is the gravamen of this letter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the letter speaks very well for itself. The position of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is apparently unyieldingly in opposition to this measure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the bill as now amended which caused this complaint to come in?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is because of the amendment which was placed in it on the motion of the Senator from Alabama and other Senators, and which the writer of the letter says would operate to destroy his union.

I stated in the earlier colloquy that no Member of the Senate, other than those who were negotiating this matter, had the slightest idea or the slightest information about the amendment which was offered yesterday and placed in the bill,

and of which the representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers complained. I further stated that it is completely impossible, in view of the time limitations imposed upon us here, to discuss the question of how widely and how seriously this bill affects either the engineers or the conductors. In further reply to the questions earlier raised—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a moment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that his committee reported a committee amendment to the effect that no employee should be required to belong to more than one union. The amendment which the Senate adopted yesterday, which had been agreed to by 21 of the 22 railway organizations, was designed to spell out in a little greater detail and to put a few more safeguards around the intent and purpose and will of the committee that no employee should be required to belong to more than one union; and of course, that is what this letter is all about.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Evidently, when the question was raised in my mind, I knew nothing about this letter, or its contents. I knew nothing of the contents of the letter until I heard it on the floor, and it seemed to me that there was some question about whether an apprentice would belong to a particular union and whether therefore a senior organization would be deprived of its membership. Yesterday on the floor I understood the distinguished Senator from Alabama to say that 21 of the 22 so-called railroad organizations were in favor of the bill as amended by the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART]. Did they know what were the provisions of the amendment which was offered by the two distinguished Senators?

Mr. HILL. Oh, surely. The representatives of the railway organizations sat around a table together and worked out the details of the amendment, and then brought it to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Alabama, and we saw that the amendment was exactly similar to the committee amendment, except that it spelled out in more detail the safeguards which were deemed necessary in order to properly do the job.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that when the Senator said "we" he meant the members. I am talking about the officials. Do the officials know what the engineers think about this proposed amendment?

Mr. HILL. Oh, certainly; they are the ones.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please. What I am trying to get into the RECORD is this: The Senator made a statement yesterday, and I take it at its face value, that 21 of the labor organizations completely approved of this legislation.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I get the idea now that the reason that the official of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is opposed to the legislation is particularly because of this new amendment, which he seems to indicate—

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. Which he seems to indicate that it would force into this one organization the apprenticed employees of the railroad, so far as the firemen and engineers are concerned. What I would like to know now is, do all of these 21 organizations know of this amendment, and is the Senator from Alabama saying now, after I have raised this question, that the 21 organizations are behind this bill as now amended by the amendment presented by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. The 21 organizations not only know of the amendment, but representatives of the 21 organizations sat around the table together, to assist in working out the amendment. They agreed to the amendment, and I read into the RECORD yesterday the letter which I now hold in my hand, signed by spokesmen for three of the four organizations which had previously opposed the bill because the amendment did not suit them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the representative who has been mentioned sit at the table when this amendment was being considered, and did he or some other representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers join in approving this amendment?

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator that I do not know the names of the personnel who sat around the table.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator knows the names of the organizations who were represented, does he not?

Mr. HILL. I may say that, so far as the author of the letter referred to by the Senator from Florida is concerned, Mr. John T. Corbett, he appeared before the committee at its hearings on this measure. He at that time opposed the bill, and he continues to oppose it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Alabama to say yesterday—and I am asking the question only to clarify the subject—

Mr. HILL. Mr. Corbett is the exception I mentioned yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot recall exactly the words which the Senator from Alabama used, but I understood him to say that the gentleman who represented the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers personally was in favor of the pending legislation, but had not been able to refer the subject to his organization. Consequently he could not say what the position of the organization would be. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. HILL. No; I have been informed to the effect that the only ones who are not urging the passage of the bill are the members of the Brotherhood of Loco-

motive Engineers. The are not opposing it. That is exactly what I said yesterday.

That was my understanding yesterday. I said also that the chief of the brotherhood feels that in view of past action he is not now in a position to endorse the bill. This morning Mr. Corbett, the gentleman referred to, came to see me. He informed me that that statement is not correct. He stated that he had opposed the bill before the subcommittee, and that he was still opposed to the bill. He wrote the letter to which the Senator from Florida has adverted.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. The Senator from Alabama will understand that I am not trying to impeach his statement.

Mr. HILL. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. However, I remember the Senator's statement.

Mr. HILL. I stated there was one exception.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. This was the exception I had in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. But the Senator from Alabama went further than that. I understood him to say that they were not opposing the proposed legislation. I am not talking about Mr. Corbett, to whom reference has been made. I believe the Senator referred to a gentleman who was personally favorable to the legislation but had not had the time to take it up with his organization.

Mr. HILL. I had been so advised yesterday. I had been advised yesterday that the head man of the organization was not opposed to the bill. This morning, Mr. Corbett, one of the assistant head men, not the grand head, came to see me, and gave me the letter which was read into the RECORD this morning. He wanted to make sure that the RECORD would be corrected so as to state the true situation. He brought another letter with this letter. I read the letter into the RECORD when the Senate convened this morning.

Mr. WHERRY. What is now the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Alabama as to whether the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is opposed to the bill? Are they opposed to it as amended, or are they in favor of it?

Mr. HILL. In the absence of any other information I would say that we must accept the word of Mr. J. T. Corbett that they are opposed to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I have one more question to ask. Does the Senator now feel that if all the other 21 organizations were advised of all the implications of the proposed legislation—and I understand they have not been informed—that they still would be favorable to the bill as amended?

Mr. HILL. I certainly think so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had two conferences this morning with Mr. Corbett, and the clear impression which I got directly from him—and I ask the attention of the Senator from Nebraska, and I hope the Senator from Alabama will follow this statement—was that his organization by convention action has been opposed to the proposed legislation and has been strongly opposed to it from

its inception, but that the offering and inclusion in the bill of the amendment of yesterday makes him personally much more vigorously opposed than he was before, because he believes its enactment in its present form would be destructive of his brotherhood.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly the question I asked of the Senator from Alabama. I have asked him over and over again, and in three different ways, whether, if what the Senator from Florida says is true with respect to the locomotive engineers, and it could not possibly also be true with respect to the Brotherhood of Conductors, because they have the same problems with respect to apprenticeship—brakemen becoming conductors, and so forth. The answer the Senator from Alabama gave—

Mr. HILL. The best answer is to refer to the letter which I have in my hand, which was written to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. HILL. December 6. It was written after the amendment was offered. They say:

If the attached proposed amendment is incorporated in the bill, the undersigned organizations are in favor of the enactment of S. 3295 and urge its adoption.

I hold in my hand the attached amendment. It is the amendment which was offered yesterday by the senior Senator from Ohio and myself, and the Senate adopted the amendment. They state:

If the attached proposed amendment is incorporated in the bill, the undersigned organizations are in favor of the enactment of S. 3295 and urge its adoption.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask what the name of the organization is?

Mr. HILL. It is signed by Jonas A. McBride, vice president, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; W. D. Johnson—

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the same organization to which reference was made earlier?

Mr. HILL. No. The reason I emphasized "enginemen" was to show that it is different from "engineers."

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. HILL. The letter is also signed by W. D. Johnson, vice president, national legislative representative, Order of Railway Conductors, and by Harry See, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think I should also say to the Senator from Nebraska that earlier in the debate, before he came on the floor of the Senate, I had stated in the RECORD that the question had been posed to me this morning that the same result which was feared by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers was in the judgment of the individual posing it this morning, just as harmful and just as dangerous in its impact upon the conductors' organization as it was upon the engineers. I communicated that information to the Senate this morning.

In concluding, Mr. President, I may say that I want it to be crystal-clear in the RECORD that the questions propounded by the able Senator from Nebraska—and they were good questions—must be answered without any equivocation, without any animadversion, and without dressing the answer up in words which do not tell the plain facts. The particular question of the Senator from Nebraska to which I refer at this time was whether or not men who are not now members of the union and who are within the classes of operating employees, would, in the event of the negotiation and entering into contracts by the operating brotherhood in that particular classification of employees, be required to join the union. The answer to that question is "yes"; they would be so required.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida understands that there would be no exception to that other than the refusal of the union to admit them, and the refusal of the union to admit them might be known in advance, but, notwithstanding that fact, every man not now a member of the union would be forced to apply for membership and subject himself to that situation, whatever it might be.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have tried to follow the debate on the pending measure, but I am still somewhat in the dark with respect to it, particularly as to where all the railroad unions stand on the proposed legislation. I am also still somewhat in the dark as to the question of States' rights which is involved. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if he knows of any urgent and compelling reason why we must act today. I understand that the majority leader plans to have a session tomorrow if we do not conclude with certain business of the Senate today. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida why the pending bill could not with great propriety go back to the committee, so that definite discussion could be had with respect to the stand of the unions on what they want, and also to give full opportunity to the committee to consider the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Florida has proposed, and which he feels is necessary to protect States' rights, in which many of us, of course, are vitally interested.

Mr. HOLLAND. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, I know of no compelling reason. I have already stated in debate that I thought it was unfortunate that debate on the pending measure should be scheduled at a time of international and national crisis, when most Members of the Senate, particularly the senior Members of the Senate, are tied up in meetings of committees which are working on important defense measures. I know of no compelling reason requiring our passing on the measure today. As a matter of fact, it is well known, as it has been stated in debate, that the House has not acted upon the measure. It has been further-

more stated in debate frequently that there is a question as to whether a rule can be secured in the House to bring the measure up for consideration in the House. I have no knowledge on that question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, since so much has been said with respect to a rule in the House, I should like to say that it would not be necessary, if the bill passes the Senate, to get a special rule in the House for its consideration there. There is a general rule in the House of Representatives which provides that if the Senate passes a bill which imposes no burden upon the Federal Treasury—in other words, does not take any money out of the Federal Treasury—it can be brought to the Speaker's desk. Thereupon the Speaker can do one of two things. He can either refer the bill to the legislative committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter, or, in the discretion of the Speaker, if he so desires to do so, he can recognize the chairman of a particular legislative committee, whereupon the chairman of such committee can move to proceed to the consideration of the bill. If a majority of the House of Representatives sustains the motion of the chairman of such committee, the bill is before the House, and the House can proceed to pass or not pass the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. In further reference to the question of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, I know of no reason which compels action on the bill today, or which would make such action highly advisable.

The second point which I wish to make is that the question propounded by the Senator from Nebraska, as to whether or not a nonmember of a union now working in an operating classification would be required at least to apply for membership must be answered "Yes."

It is further complicated by another question, which arose earlier in the debate today, and that is as to what is the status of a member of the only CIO union which is found in this field, which is not a class or craft union, but which covers all classes of employees in the railway industry, for example, from maintenance-of-way men up to engineers and conductors. In this connection it was stated to the Senator from Florida this morning by one of the representatives of the railroad employees whose name I am not free to state that there are numerous members of the classifications which would be affected by this bill who are members of the CIO union and not members of any brotherhood. As the Senator from Florida reads this measure, such a person, though now a member of a union which does not serve merely a class or craft, would, equally with a nonmember of any union, be required to apply for a membership in one of the craft or class unions.

The Senator from Florida is not certain that his decision in that connection is correct. He has invited the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], any or all of them, who might have sounder information on that subject, to

comment upon the question which has been posed to the junior Senator from Florida, namely, as to what are the rights and what would be the requirements imposed upon a union member whose membership was not in any of the craft brotherhoods, but in the CIO union, the transport workers union, in the event of the passage of this bill, and in the event of the negotiation of a union-shop contract by a particular brotherhood with a particular railroad, governing employment on that railroad.

It would seem to the Senator from Florida, from the mere wording of the provision, that such a union member, whose membership was in the CIO transport workers' union, would be required to apply for a membership in the appropriate brotherhood.

I read the language which appears, at least to me, to so indicate, and which raised that question in the mind of the person inquiring of me. I quote from the amendment adopted yesterday. The wording is this:

Provided, however, That as to an employee in any of said services on a particular carrier at the effective date of any such agreement on a carrier, who is not a member of any one of the labor organizations, national in scope, organized in accordance with this act and admitting to membership employees of a craft or class in any of said services, such employee, as a condition of continuing his employment, may be required to become a member of the organization representing the craft in which he is employed on the effective date of the first agreement applicable to him.

I do not attempt to state what that means with any finality of authority, because I was not present at the drafting. I do not know what the draftsmen meant. I am not clear even as to the interpretation of this language. I have simply conveyed to the Senate the complaint which came to me, and the question which came to me this morning as to whether that provision would require a member of the transport workers union in one of these classifications who would be affected by a union-shop agreement, notwithstanding his membership in that union, to apply for a membership in one of the brotherhoods. I do not pretend to give a final answer to that question. At least it has been seriously raised.

Mr. President, I relinquish the floor.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure what the procedure is going to be. In the light of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] relative to the advisability of possibly making a motion to recommit the bill to committee, with instructions to report back on a day certain, and also because of the lengthy debate which has ensued, I am wondering if there will be an opportunity to suggest to the acting majority leader that he tell us what he has in mind relative to a vote on the so-called Holland amendment, or his reaction to the observations

made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that we on this side of the aisle will be very happy to cooperate in any procedure which is decided upon. If there is to be considerable debate, I feel that if we can agree upon a time when we may have a vote, such an agreement should be entered into. It would be in order. But if a motion is to be made to recommit the bill, the sooner the motion is before us the better. The majority leader has indicated that he would like to take up the bill relating to aid to Yugoslavia this afternoon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished friend that the distinguished majority leader has been tied up all day in the Finance Committee, and I have not had an opportunity to confer with him today. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida is about to speak. If it is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, at the very first opportunity I shall confer with the majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall appreciate it very much. Senators are very much interested in knowing what the procedure is to be. I think it would be a very fortunate thing if a unanimous-consent agreement could be entered into. I believe that such a proposal would meet with the approval of all Senators.

In the meantime, if such a motion as that suggested by the Senator from Virginia is to be forthcoming, I think it would be well to get it before the Senate as soon as possible. After all, if we are to expedite the work of the Senate, we should look ahead and plan it.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate what the Senator has said.

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

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have very recently conferred with the distinguished majority leader about the bill, and he told me that he was very anxious to have action on it concluded today. There are on the floor of the Senate now 11 Senators, and that is about as many as there have been present since the first quorum call was had. How valuable the pro-and-con debate may be I don't know. I admit it has been good so far, but it does not influence those who do not hear it. For that reason, knowing that some of us are still in great doubt, I thought that if there were no particular reason why we should rush the bill through today, in these troubled times, we might recommit it. Otherwise, I would very much favor having an early vote on the merits of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I will cooperate with the Senator 100 percent to get an early vote. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida advised me a little while ago that he would not occupy a great deal of time, and when he concludes his remarks, I do not know why we should not go ahead and vote on the Holland amendment and dispose of it, and proceed with any other amendments and dispose of them,

and then vote on the bill and dispose of it. I have no disposition to delay the bill. On the other hand, I have every desire to get action on it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The majority leader asked me if there was any filibuster on the bill. I told him that, on the contrary, I was very certain Senators were anxious to dispose of the bill at as early a moment as possible, that there was no filibuster on the part of any Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator having the floor will yield, I think that in all fairness to the Senator having the bill in charge I should inform him that my colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], informed me about an hour ago that he would offer an amendment to the bill, the anti-segregation amendment. I thought I owed it to the Senator having the bill in charge so to inform him.

Mr. HILL. Is the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana in the city at this time?

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand he will be here.

Mr. HILL. It does not necessarily follow that if he offers the amendment there will be any lengthy debate on it, does it?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer that question. If he is not able to arrive in time, then he has asked that I offer the amendment for him, and as a courtesy to him, I shall do that. If I offer the amendment, I assure the Senator that there will be no time consumed by me in making a speech. However, if my colleague himself arrives, I cannot tell how long he will talk. He is insisting that his amendment be offered, and in courtesy to him, which I am sure the able Senator from Alabama understands, I shall offer it in his behalf if he is not here; but if I offer it, there will be no speech on my part.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana just one question about the amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; but I know very little about it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator says it is an anti-segregation amendment. Is it really the FEPC amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer the question. The amendment has been lying on the table since the first of September. I am merely acting as my colleague's agent, at his request, showing the courtesy that any other Senator would show to a colleague.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. In view of the present situation, and the clear indication that it will be impossible to vote on the bill either today or tomorrow, I inquire of the Senator from Alabama, if he would have any objection to a unanimous-consent request that a vote be taken on the bill and all amendments thereto on next Monday, with the usual provision regarding debate on each side of not more than 10 minutes on any amendment which might be offered.

Mr. HILL. In view of the amendment which the Senator from Indiana has stated, his colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana, desires to offer to the bill, and will offer if he is present, I do not think we can agree at this time on any time for a vote, or any limitation such as that suggested by the Senator from West Virginia. I do not know what the junior Senator from Florida has in mind, but I do not know why, after the senior Senator from Florida concludes his remarks, we might not vote on the amendment of the junior Senator from Florida. Would that be agreeable to the Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. It would not be agreeable, Mr. President, in the sense that I feel we have had a fair chance, because so many Senators have left the city before they knew the bill was coming up, who take the same position the Senator from Florida takes. But he certainly will not interpose any debate simply for the purpose of delay. He has no intention of so doing. He said that to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. He certainly did.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have simply asserted the right to speak today in order to round out the statements I made yesterday, which I had not had time to round out then. I have consumed time today largely by reason of colloquies which ensued during my discussion yesterday, as the Senator knows.

Mr. President, we would have no objection to voting at any time when we can come to it. I would rather have the vote go over until Monday, because the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are necessarily out of the city. They were called out before they knew the measure was to be taken up for consideration. They have very strong feelings with respect to the measure. They would want to see adopted the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I do not feel good about the whole situation, and I do not feel that those who hold the same views I hold have been treated with much consideration in this matter. I see nothing we can do about it, however, other than to put on a long talkathon, which I have no intention of doing.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. May I propound a question to the distinguished acting majority leader in respect to the query made by my able friend and colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]? Now that the Senator has stated it would be impossible to secure unanimous consent to vote on the bill on Monday, because of the announcement made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], would there be any objection to entering into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Monday on the so-called Holland amendments? There are two of them.

Mr. HILL. The two amendments embody the same matters. I imagine it

would be agreeable to the junior Senator from Florida to vote on them en bloc.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean to vote only on the Holland amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would not only be agreeable to vote on those amendments, which as I stated heretofore in the debate should be considered as one amendment—and I made that request—but I should also be glad to include in the request that we vote on a motion to table the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Indiana. I agree with the Senator from Alabama. I would not want to set an arbitrary time for a vote on that particular amendment at this time. But I would be willing to include in the unanimous-consent request a vote on a motion to table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are now coming to the point where we shall be able to secure a unanimous-consent agreement, if the Senator from Alabama will agree with the Senator from Florida. I should like to ask, however, that the Senator from Indiana be permitted 30 minutes to present his amendment, and at that time we will agree that a motion to table be entered, so there will be no long debate about the amendment. I think that would be fair.

Mr. HILL. If the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may now be permitted to proceed, I shall confer with the majority leader, and when I have conferred with him, I shall be glad to advise with other Senators further.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me for an observation?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The junior Senator from Florida has just had the privilege of a brief conversation with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. He is thoroughly in accord with the feeling that the suggestion by the junior Senator from West Virginia is sound and workable. He will gladly accommodate himself to it. That suggestion is that we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Monday on the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Florida, and on a motion to table the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], with the understanding that the Senator from Florida is perfectly willing to waive any additional argument on his amendments, and to yield to the junior Senator from Indiana, or whomsoever he may designate to speak for at least half of the time allotted, prior to the vote.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the suggestion made by the junior Senator from Florida. I believe the regular procedure ought to be followed. I believe the Senator from Alabama will agree with me relative to the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement. There is one thing I should like to suggest, beyond the usual terms of such an agreement. I think we can agree on an hour to vote, and on how the time shall be divided prior to the hour to vote, and that we then give a certain amount of time to any additional amendments which may be of-

fered and which are germane. However, I wish to have included in the agreement that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] be permitted to speak on the amendment he proposes to offer. All I ask is that before the agreement is entered into, there be included in it the provision that the Senator from Indiana may have 30 minutes in which to explain his amendment. On that basis I am satisfied we can agree upon the time when a vote may be had.

Mr. HILL. I suggest that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be allowed to proceed, and we can in the meantime endeavor to secure an agreement.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator from Alabama know of any additional speeches which are proposed to be made after the senior Senator from Florida has concluded?

Mr. HILL. I know of no other speakers who intend to address themselves to the pending amendments. The Senator from Nebraska said he wanted provision to be made for half an hour for the distinguished Senator from Indiana on his amendment.

CANCER CONTROL AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Florida yield to me for about 3 minutes, so I may make a short statement and present a matter for insertion in the RECORD, relating to cancer research?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the subject of cancer control and research activities which are no less essential and no less worthy of our support today than in more peaceful times. We are all concerned, of course, with the news from the Far East and from the fighting front where American soldiers are defending freedom with their lives. But in spite of these far-off events we still have a responsibility to consider some of those forces that are threatening the lives of so many of our people here at home. I trust that in the stress of events we will always have time to honor those who, in our own communities, are showing devotion to the relief of human suffering.

We are always fighting mortal enemies of disease that cause death, regardless of age, color, or creed. In this classification there is no more ruthless enemy than the terrible scourge of cancer. I want to pay a special tribute to the devoted volunteers throughout the country, and particularly in my own State of New Jersey, who are fighting day and night to control the upward trend of this disease which yearly claims more than 200,000 lives of our own countrymen.

Our Federal Government, through the National Cancer Institute, is aiding in this battle and contributes millions of dollars for research into the causes of the disease. This fund is increased by contributions made to the American Cancer Society by the people in every State, who in this past year alone raised nearly

\$14,000,000 to carry out the program of education and service, as well as research.

While scientific research is being carried on the present sufferers of the disease are not being neglected. A campaign emphasizing the necessity of periodic visits to family physicians as one of the preventatives is being carried on throughout the country. Clinics have been opened where patients have access to X-ray equipment, radium, medications and dressings, and many other services.

In my own State of New Jersey the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society was organized 4 years ago by Mr. George E. Stringfellow and is now under the presidency of Mr. J. Wesley Goldthorp. This division has done an outstanding piece of work and I wish to pay tribute to these two men and their associates for the able leadership which they have freely given to this cause.

One of the outstanding features of the New Jersey division's program is the annual editorial contest during national cancer-control month each April. Daily and weekly newspapers in the State contribute editorials in addition to news space during the annual fund-raising campaign. Three judges select the best of these editorials and the winners are awarded the George E. Stringfellow plaques.

The winners in 1950 were the Paterson Evening News in the daily field for an editorial written by Abe J. Greene, and the Delaware Valley News of Frenchtown in the weekly field for an editorial written by Sydney A. DeCosta.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two winning editorials on this important subject of cancer control be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Paterson Evening News of May 11, 1950]

BEMOANING THE DEVASTATION OF CANCER WON'T CURE IT—IF YOU REALLY WANT TO HELP, HERE'S HOW TO DO IT

Let's pull up a chair, neighbor. Just for a friendly chat between ourselves.

Don't let's talk about world affairs. Let's leave the Iron Curtain, the Commies, China, the Big Three, Pakistan and other problems like that to our statesmen. They can take care of themselves—we hope.

Let's leave Congress, for the moment at least, to the Congressmen; State laws to our legislators.

Let's talk about something closer to home. Mrs. Jones, next door, for instance. The poor woman, they do say, is in the last stages of life. She has suffered for months, endlessly, pitifully, hopelessly. The doctors say she may pass on within a week, perhaps linger on for a month. And she with everything to live for, three darling children, a devoted husband, a nice home.

Cancer!

It's rather terrifying, isn't it, the way cancer is striking so many people we know. One out of eight, they say. Seems like more than that, from the news we get nearly every day of this friend and that one stricken.

What's to be done? Do we sit by, enjoying ourselves, life's pleasures and fruits, while all this goes on and we do nothing about it? My God, man, it may be our turn next.

What's to be done?

Listen, neighbor:

We're sitting here at peace with the world, everything rosy, nice comfortable homes, the season of the year when nature is blooming, and our spirits with it.

Suppose a man came up to us now and asked us for a dollar—just one dollar—to save his life. Would we give the dollar? Give a dollar! Why, that's preposterous. We'd give five, ten, fifty, a hundred if we knew we could save the man's life.

We would, eh?

Well, the Paterson committee sent out 35,000 letters asking for a dollar from each of the people to whom the letter was sent. One dollar.

And you think, don't you, that every one of those letters brought a quick response? Well, you're wrong. Less than one-tenth of them answered the letters, and of a goal of \$30,000 for the city, only \$17,250 has been raised in Paterson, and less than half of the \$70,000 goal in the county. And that amount includes collections at public affairs and the more substantial contributions from people who were willing to give more than \$1.

Some folks resort to the excuse: If someone would only ask me.

Neighbor, cancer doesn't ask, doesn't knock on the door. It strikes with terrible suddenness and terrifying effect.

The only chance those of us who have been spared the dreaded visitation is to bolster the doctors, the scientists, the researchers, who are working ceaselessly, courageously, self-sacrificingly, to fight the disease, find its cause and its cure.

Every dollar we give goes to the great fight. Read the statement on page 1 of tonight's News by Dr. James S. Gallo, an expert on cancer.

Read how the money is spent, how hopes will rise in the proportion that we give. And how many will die because so many of us are laggards, either refusing to give or being lazy about the giving.

And after reading Dr. Gallo's fine statement, fill out the coupon on page 69 of tonight's News send it to Chairman Jack Stern, Paterson Cancer Committee, 169 Van Houten Street, along with your dollar, 5, 10, or whatever you're able to give.

And then thank God for His benefactions which have made it possible for you to give rather than have to receive.

[From the Delaware Valley News of April 28, 1950]

NO ONE KNOWS

I remember the first time I saw her. She was a lovely dark-haired girl. Her jet-black eyes, all warm and friendly, basked in the glow of vibrant health.

Four years of war went by before I saw this girl again. She was a mother now. Two black-eyed children filled the joyful household with infant laughter. And she was only 22.

Six months later she was dead. Two women behind me in the church whispered grave accompaniment to the organ's requiem sobs—"She was so young." * * * "Yes; isn't it a pity. And those two lovely children." * * * "It was so quick." * * * "Yes; cancer, you know."

But who knew? No one knew. Not the girl herself. Not the doctors who tried to save. Not her wounded relatives and friends. No one knew. Cancer had simply claimed another victim, and no one knew.

Today men of science work endlessly to find this deadly killer's secret. But the search is hard and costly. Great quantities of time and money will be consumed before the cause and cure of cancer become known. That is why we are asked to contribute to the cancer fund.

While most of us cannot actually do cancer research, we can give money to the cause. Our contributions help rush the day when doctors may fight cancer in the open. Sometimes the secret seems maddeningly close. We owe it to ourselves and to those yet unborn to do all we can to find the cure as quickly as possible. And the best way we can help is to give money to those who are hot on the trail of this scourge.

S. A. D.

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

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Oregon will excuse me, I wish to say that I had previously agreed to yield to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Before the Senator from Florida yields to my colleague, I wish to thank him for having yielded to me. I know he is interested in the subject of cancer research, as I am. I appreciate very much the opportunity he has just given me to present this matter.

Mr. PEPPER. And, Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate the contribution the Senator from New Jersey has made.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, although H. R. 331, a bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, has been returned to the calendar, I shall continue to entertain high hope that the Members of the Senate will be given a fair chance to vote their conviction on this highly important legislation before the end of the current session.

There are countless thousands of people throughout the country who feel precisely as I do in respect to the merits of this legislation and they feel very strongly, Mr. President, that the least we can do in this waning session is to treat with this issue courageously and squarely, and this can only mean one thing, namely, to give every Member of the Senate the opportunity to record his conviction on the subject of statehood, in the case of both Alaska and Hawaii.

Some of the people who are looking to us for action on these measures are great leaders in very important segments of our Nation. One of these is New Jersey's Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll. Governor Driscoll has written me on several occasions in respect to the statehood bills, but his most recent letter which reached my desk this morning sums the issue up so eloquently that it deserves the most careful consideration by every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. To the end that the brief but no less impressive arguments which Governor Driscoll's letter presents may be carefully studied by all Senators who have a proper regard for party-platform commitments and openly declared obligations, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, December 7, 1950.

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I am surprised that there appears to be an unwillingness on the part of the United States Senate to approve statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The Democrat national platform in 1948 stated: "We urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, immediate determination by the people of Puerto Rico as to their form of government and their ultimate status with respect to the United States, and the maximum degree of local self-government for the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa."

The Republican 1948 platform stated: "We favor eventual statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico." While it is true that the Republican platform used the word "eventual," it was nonetheless designed to give the impression that we favored statehood. How can we preach the theory of home rule if we are unwilling to give it to those who are asking for it?

I know that you are doing everything you can to support statehood for these two deserving Territories. I do hope that you will use your influence to prevent any tie between some Republicans and the southern Democrats. There is nothing to be gained by either side from such an unfortunate alliance.

While I do not have a personal acquaintance with Hawaii, I know Alaska and its people. Based on my personal knowledge, I am confident that both Territories, when they become States, may be counted upon to send good representatives to Congress. These Territories have served long and honorable apprenticeships. Their citizens have indicated a capacity for responsible representative government. They are now entitled to all the privileges and rights accorded to American citizens by our Constitution, including the right of voting representation in the Congress of the United States.

It seems to me to be significant that the governors of the 48 States have on numerous occasions considered this problem, and with impressive unanimity of opinion favored statehood. We are fortunately given an opportunity to support the proposal for statehood on the merits, as well as on the basis of international political expediency. To grant statehood at this time would be tangible evidence that we practice what we preach. The admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood would be a dramatic demonstration that our Republic has reached full maturity. It is growing in strength and authority as the chief proponent of representative government.

I would count it a personal favor if you would give me some indication of exactly how our Republicans stand on this proposal. Who is for the proposal and who is against it?

With kindest personal regards and sincere goods wishes, I am,

Your friend,

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I may say that only a few days ago I had the privilege of spending 2 days in Honolulu, and to hear from our Navy personnel and other Government representatives there of the loyalty and patriotism of the Hawaiian people and their interest in the national security and strength. I heartily subscribe to the sentiments just uttered by the distinguished junior Sen-

ator from New Jersey that the Members of the Senate should be given the privilege of voting on the question of admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the Union.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for the privilege he has so kindly given me to present this matter.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN EAST COAST TANKER INDUSTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, of which I have the honor to be a member, will in the near future submit to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a report of an investigation of labor-management relations in the east coast tanker industry. I hope that every Member of the Senate will take the time to read that report. It will summarize uncontradicted testimony showing that deplorable conditions exist in that industry, conditions which we thought had been made impossible by laws guaranteeing to workers the rights to self-organization and collective bargaining.

I shall not take the time now to describe these conditions, but I do desire to direct the attention of the Senate to an excellent article which commences on page 48 of the December issue of *Fortune*. The article is entitled "Cities Service's Big Mistake," and is an excellent account of the facts revealed by our investigation. It is particularly gratifying that this great journal, *Fortune*, which represents so ably the point of view and policies of American employers, should print this account and thus emphasize the fact that the typical American employer is opposed to the vicious antilabor practices of the few who create and tolerate bad labor relations.

Our subcommittee has been functioning for more than a year under the outstanding chairmanship of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Under his leadership, the investigations have proceeded carefully, judiciously, and efficiently. I believe that the Senator from Montana is entitled to the congratulations of the Senate for the fair and fearless manner in which he has conducted these proceedings.

I now ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in *Fortune* magazine be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

CITIES SERVICE'S BIG MISTAKE—IT USED EVERY TRICK IN THE BOOK, BUT COULDN'T KEEP OUT THE UNION

For four hard years the Seafarers International Union (A. F. of L.) grappled with the Cities Service Oil Co. Finally, on September 22 of this year, the seamen won out; they signed a contract with Cities Service and became bargaining agent of the unionized men on the company's 16 east coast tankers. Three days later, on September 25, a Senate labor subcommittee began taking a look at what had been going on.

The hearings were conducted quietly, without theatrics, floodlights, or standing-room audiences, in a drab caucus room in the Senate Office Building. But what they produced was as lurid as anything since the days of the La Follette committee. They began with 5 hours of testimony by Paul Hall, the director of the SIU's Atlantic & Gulf District, stating the case for the prosecution: Hall charged that Cities Service had spent 4 years in stalling, firing prouction seamen, employing labor spies, organizing a company union, recruiting seamen in water-front saloons, and generally conducting itself according to a pattern that was elsewhere obsolescent in American labor relations. He was followed, later in the day, by the former Cities Service shipping master in New York, who told a long, complicated story involving his relations with company espionage agents, his belief that his phone was tapped by a company lawyer, and his instructions not to hire A. F. of L. seamen.

The second day's hearings completed the rout of Cities Service. Several attorneys and private detectives testified in detail to their roles in the espionage ring. A Cities Service vice president, who was one of the last to testify, made no serious effort to refute the charges; his prepared statement involved mostly a recantation of the patriotic activities of the company during World War II. All things considered, the 2 days of testimony comprised just about the worst public relations an American corporation could have.

When the SIU first went to work on Cities Service in 1946, it knew it was picking a tartar. The CIO maritime workers had won an NLRB election on Cities Service tankers back in 1938, but 9 years of intermittent negotiations had not produced a contract. On two occasions during those years, the NLRB forced Cities Service to shut down company unions. The east coast oil tankers were, in fact, almost completely closed to the A. F. of L. and CIO. Although Cities Service subsidiaries have 125 contracts with unions, the marine division has been bitterly opposed to the SIU.

The 4-year fight actually involved only 470-odd seamen. The first of the 4 years was consumed mainly in resolving an argument between the SIU and the CIO maritime workers as to which was the appropriate challenger. In October 1947 the NLRB threw out the latter, and ordered an election between the SIU and no union. At that time the SIU claimed 55 percent of the unionized seamen on the Cities Service fleet.

Cities Service made it plain from the beginning that it was in no hurry to get the issue settled. It asked and received a 60-day extension of the voting time; later, another 10 days was granted. After the voting had begun, the company asked for still another extension period, this time 75 days, to allow one of its ships in the Pacific to participate. Since the ship might be gone for months, the NLRB denied the request, and also denied a variety of company requests for alterations in the eligibility requirements. Finally, on February 9, 1948, the votes were counted. They showed that the SIU had won 83 percent of the ballots.

From February to May of 1948, Cities Service belabored the NLRB with protests against the balloting, all of which were overruled. On May 24, 1948, the SIU was certified as the appropriate bargaining agent for 7 ships that had been voted. There were still 9 tankers to be accounted for—the one that had been in the Pacific during the original balloting, and 8 new ships acquired just previously. The NLRB announced that on January 5, 1949, it would hold a meeting to arrange for votes on these 9 ships. Cities Service declined to participate, however, asserting that it had not been formally notified. The meeting was then postponed until Feb-

ruary 16, at which time the company threatened not to cooperate unless the board rescinded a 10-year-old order permitting CIO organizers on its ships.

When the voting finally began, on February 20, several tankers refused to allow the NLRB representatives on board to conduct the election. It was then necessary, in some cases, to use launches, which could approach the tankers as they docked and advertise the time and place of the election with loudspeakers. On February 22, after 6 ships had managed to vote, Cities Service went into court and got a temporary injunction that stopped the balloting and impounded the votes already cast. Shortly afterward, however, the injunction was dismissed and the voting was resumed.

On April 15 a court appearance was made by representatives of the Citco Tanker Men's Association, which had been quickly organized a few months before and which the SIU repeatedly denounced as company-dominated. The CTMA asked for an injunction to prevent the counting of ballots; it claimed the election was unfair since it did not have a place on the ballot. The injunction was denied, the votes were counted, and the SIU was found to have won 89 percent of the votes. Cities Service immediately filed 19 objections to the conduct of the election, all of which, 4 months later, were denied by the NLRB in Washington. Not unexpectedly, the company came right back with a list of "exceptions to the objection." These were taken under consideration, then finally denied on December 2, 1949.

It was now 38 months since the union had first asked for a contract. As yet, no collective bargaining had taken place and, as it turned out, Cities Service was not quite ready to begin. On December 15, CTMA put in another appearance, demanding this time that the NLRB certify it as the representative of the seamen who had voted in the first (seven-ship) election. The board denied the request and CTMA inevitably, asked for a review of the decision. This was forthcoming on January 19, 1950, when the NLRB again ruled that the SIU was bargaining agent on the tankers. On February 8, bargaining began.

An interim contract was signed on March 10, stipulating that the company pay the SIU tanker scale on its ships. But just when it began to look as if the long, excruciating battle might be ending, the question of labor espionage came into the open.

The trouble was, the union complained at the Senate hearings, that while Cities Service was sitting down to the bargaining table with the SIU, it was firing SIU men. The union claimed that SIU men had been kept off the company's tankers, so far as was possible, ever since 1946. The SIU said that one of the chief reasons for the organization of CTMA in 1948 was to enable Cities Service to smoke out SIU men on the ships—by noting those who refused to go along with the new union. Whatever the truth about this, there was no dispute over the fact that Cities Service and the CTMA were hiring private detectives on a large scale. Caesar L. Scotti, a New York operative, told the Senate committee that he had been hired by a company attorney to get to know SIU men so that he could "finger" them when they entered the Cities Service hiring office. Two seamen, Anthony Hennessey and John Basciano, were hired to ship out on Cities Service tankers and inform on SIU activity at closer range. A licensed investigator in New York, Daniel J. Griffin, was hired to dig up what he could on the SIU leaders. The SIU complained at the hearings that several other men were more or less constantly engaged in shadowing their officials.

To round out the portrait of Cities Service labor relations during 1949 and early 1950 it might be added that these operatives were also up to their ears in shadowing one another. Scotti was instructed to keep an eye on James Hanaway, the company shipping master, whose office, in addition, was said to be wire-tapped. (The tap was denied by Cities Service.) The company's suspicion of Hanaway appears to have been justified; he admitted at the hearings that he had been paid at least \$700 by the SIU and was busily working for both sides. Scotti was also shadowing Hennessey, whom the company apparently never trusted, but the suspicions proved unfounded. Hennessey, meanwhile, was shadowing a CTMA lawyer named Albert Strasburger. Strasburger was the man who had hired Griffin to get some dirt on the SIU.

On June 5 of this year the NLRB took up the unfair-labor practice cases arising from the espionage. After 3 days of hearings the company interrupted the proceedings with an announcement that it was willing to settle all the disputed points. It agreed to comply with all the NLRB demands, to rehire 151 men allegedly discharged for SIU activity, to pay \$150,000 in back wages, and to bargain in good faith from that point on. The settlement stipulation, which was enforced by the second circuit court, also dissolved the CTMA.

The contract was finally signed on September 22. It was negotiated, incidentally, not by the marine-division officials of Cities Service, but by lawyers on the corporation level. Since the signing, relations have been excellent.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as a member of that committee, I wish to join in the tribute which has just been paid to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for the splendid manner in which he, as chairman of the subcommittee, has conducted the investigation. He has shown fairness, objectivity and intense, keen interest in the subject; and I think he has served well the Senate and the entire country as chairman of the subcommittee in connection with the inquiry.

AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent agreement, if it is understood that by doing so the Senator will not prejudice his rights to the floor?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, perhaps we should have a quorum call at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. This proposal does not relate to the final vote on the bill, of course.

Mr. HILL. It does not relate to the final vote on the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, a number of Senators who are interested in Senate bill 3295, the pending measure, and also are interested in the amendment which now is being debated, known as the Holland amendment, have practically agreed upon the time for the vote, through a unanimous-consent agreement.

I am going to place the proposed unanimous-consent agreement before the Senate to see whether we can make some progress on it. I ask unanimous consent that the so-called Holland amendment to Senate bill 3295, Calendar 2263—

Mr. HILL. The amendment as presented.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, the Holland amendment, as presented—be voted upon at the hour of 1 o'clock on Monday next; that the time on the amendment be divided equally between the opponents and the proponents, to be controlled by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], after the quorum call is had upon the convening of the Senate on that day; following that, the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which is the amendment dealing with the FEPC bill, will be offered to Senate bill 3295; and on that amendment the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] shall have 15 minutes and the opponents of the amendment shall have 15 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let us make it clear that after the Senator from Indiana has had his opportunity to speak for 15 minutes and after the opponents have had an opportunity to speak, if they see fit to do so, or if they think they should do so, in answer to the Senator from Indiana, then a motion to lay on the table will come.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I have not yet reached that point of the unanimous-consent proposal.

Mr. HILL. But I wish to make it clear that the 30 minutes of debate on the amendment must not preclude further debate on the amendment in the event the motion to table fails.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is understood, and I was going to include that in the proposed agreement.

Mr. President, my thoughts have been considerably disturbed by the interruptions on the part of the Senator from Alabama, but I shall not repeat what I have already stated in regard to the proposal.

I think I was about to say that it is proposed that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] shall have 15 minutes on his amendment and the opponents shall have 15 minutes; following that a motion to table shall be in order; and if the motion to table fails, the so-called Jenner amendment will still be before the Senate for debate.

Mr. HILL. For debate that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry first: Has the so-called Jenner amendment been submitted?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think it has. It has been lying around for several weeks, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the amendment has not yet been submitted.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it should be submitted, so there will be no question as to what it is; or at least in the pro-

posed unanimous-consent agreement the Jenner amendment should be identified. I think that should be done.

Mr. LUCAS. I have already said that it is the so-called Jenner amendment, known as the FEPC amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon; that is fine. I have no objection, then.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] wished to speak at this time, I believe.

Mr. CAPEHART. No, thank you; the Senator from Nebraska has covered what I had in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not wish to have to object—

Mr. LUCAS. Please do not.

Mr. MORSE. I will object unless the unanimous-consent request is presented after a quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum at this time, if the Senator from Florida will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, probably there is more unanimity at the present time than there might be later on, so I shall not stand in the way of increasing the unanimity. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida is always in favor of unanimity, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. President, I now 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	Holland	Myers
Anderson	Hunt	Neely
Brewster	Ives	Nixon
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kefauver	Pepper
Byrd	Kem	Robertson
Cain	Kerr	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Carlson	Knowland	Schoeppel
Chapman	Langer	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Long	Stennis
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McCarran	Taylor
Douglas	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eaton	McFarland	Thye
Ellender	McKellar	Tobey
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
George	Malone	Watkins
Gillette	Martin	Wherry
Gurney	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	Millikin	Williams
Hendrickson	Morse	Young
Hickenlooper	Mundt	
Hill	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Florida had the floor. I think he felt that a unanimous-consent agreement might be entered into, and that therefore he would not continue his speech this afternoon. The majority leader was going to propound a unanimous-consent request at this time, I understood.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the majority leader has conferred with the minority leader, and I feel that all the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement have been reduced to the point

where they meet the objections of all those who had anything to say about them.

Mr. LUCAS entered the Chamber.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say for the RECORD that my colleague, who had the floor, had a long-standing engagement at the Senate Restaurant. He went to the restaurant to keep the engagement, and requested that he be notified in the event of a failure to enter into the unanimous-consent agreement. I, of course, shall protect him in that matter by holding the floor, in the event it becomes necessary to do so. But I hope, with him, that the agreement will be entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Illinois previous to the quorum call? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, December 11, 1950, at the hour of 1 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the amendment of Mr. HOLLAND, as proposed on December 7, 1950, to the bill (S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions; and that the time intervening between a quorum call, to be had upon the convening of the Senate on said day, and said hour of 1 o'clock shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing said amendment and controlled, respectively, by Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. HILL.

Ordered further, That following the vote on the so-called Holland amendment, the Senate immediately proceed to consider the amendment, lettered A, submitted by Mr. JENNER on September 1, 1950, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed; that debate thereon be limited to 30 minutes and equally divided and controlled by Mr. JENNER and Mr. HILL; that following the expiration of the time for debate it shall be in order to move to lay said amendment on the table, and if such motion to lay on the table is rejected, the further consideration of said amendment shall proceed under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that the interest of many Senators in seeking the unanimous-consent agreement was in order to permit the majority leader to take up the announced legislation to grant aid to Yugoslavia. I think the RECORD ought to show that the agreement has come about through cooperation on the part of Members of the Senate from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad the Senator from Nebraska has made that statement. It is only 3 o'clock, and in view of the Senator's statement, it seems to me that we can probably pass this bill yet this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps so.

EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, the bill (S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union mem-

bership and agreements for deduction from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes, and under certain conditions, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the request of the majority leader was to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business?

Mr. LUCAS. The request was to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and to proceed to the consideration of the Yugoslavia relief bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill under consideration would authorize relief to Yugoslavia because of the terrible drought which that country has suffered during the past year. Under the emergency powers which the President possesses \$31,000,000 has already been provided for that purpose. Senate bill 4234 would authorize \$38,000,000 more. Those who are familiar with the facts involved are strongly in favor of the passage of the measure. I shall read a brief statement dealing with the bill, after which I shall make some additional comments.

If any Senator 2 years ago had suggested that I would today be standing on the floor of the United States Senate advocating \$38,000,000 for aid to Communist Yugoslavia, I should have called him to order. Yet today I support and urge the earliest possible enactment of S. 4234 because I believe, as do other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the security of the United States requires this action.

Woodrow Wilson in an address to the United States Senate in 1937 said:

I am seeking only to face realities and to face them without soft concealment.

That is what I shall try to do in telling my colleagues as briefly as possible, why we must at this moment in history, give assistance to Yugoslavia—a country whose people we admire but whose government leaves much to be desired.

We must help Yugoslavia because it is the only state that once, under the domination of the Kremlin, has successfully defied the Kremlin. Since before the war, the Soviet Union has expanded its territories by every means conceivable. The roster of once free states, now captive, is long and depressing: Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East

Germany, and now China. Not one of these states is independent. Not one official of these states would dare make a decision different than that dictated by Moscow. Not a single one of these states that is a member of the United Nations would dare vote differently from the Soviet Union.

Yugoslavia was once a member of this extinguished list of independent states. While I have never had a good thing to say for a Communist or for communism, Marshal Tito is one Communist who knows when he has had enough. He had enough from the Kremlin when he found Yugoslavia invaded from the Soviet Union by military advisers, economic experts, and political henchmen, all of them ready to act for the good of the Soviet Union no matter what the consequences to Yugoslavia. He had enough when he realized that the Soviet brand of communism was but a shield for the Machiavellian imperialism of a Politburo seeking world domination no matter what the cost.

Now that the break between Tito and Stalin has come, it is in the interests of the United States to see that Marshal Tito is able to maintain his independence. If the economic blockade that Stalin imposed upon Yugoslavia, if satellite military moves on the borders of Yugoslavia, if the drought of last summer, if any of these things should endanger Yugoslav independence from the Soviet Union, it would hurt the cause of the free world.

We should never lose sight of the fact that Yugoslavia has the largest standing army in Europe, outside the Soviet Union. More than 30 divisions stand ready to defend that country from attack. The threat to Yugoslav independence comes not from the west, but from the east. The Yugoslavs know that. That is why they must maintain a large army ever ready to defend them from the Soviet bloc. We need to maintain that strength on the side of freedom.

The Foreign Relations Committee heard witnesses who told of the severity of the drought last summer in Yugoslavia. Other nations of the west, including Great Britain, are helping Yugoslavia meet the effects of that drought. I believe we must continue the help which the President began this fall while the Congress was in recess.

I want to make it crystal clear that my support of this legislation is because it will help to preserve an independent country from Soviet imperialism. I condemn what Tito has done to religion and to human freedoms in Yugoslavia, but in times like these we cannot demand perfection as a price for our assistance.

In that connection we wish to offer an amendment. I shall read the amendment before I conclude my remarks.

The legislation before the Senate sets forth certain conditions that must be met before we will give aid under this bill. Many of these conditions have already been met. Yugoslavia has agreed to give publicity to our aid. She is already performing on that promise. She must agree to make local funds available to us for use in administering the program, and, to the extent that Yugoslavia sells the goods we supply, she must

make equivalent local currency available for such uses as we agree to, such as medical aid, relief for children, and similar projects.

Under the terms of this bill money will not be given to Yugoslavia. The dollars will be spent here in the United States for commodities most of which are surplus to our needs. Some 71 percent of the money will be used for buying commodities already in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. There will be only a few items, such as seeds and rice, that will be purchased on the open market.

In conclusion, let me say that sometimes the best way to fight fire is with fire. We now have a Communist backfire burning in Yugoslavia. I want to keep that fire burning. I do not want to let it be quenched. I want Yugoslavia's insistence on independence from Moscow to stiffen the backbone of people throughout the world who see the terrible dangers of Soviet imperialism cloaked in the robes of international communism.

I hope very much that the Senate will give its overwhelming approval to this bill, and demonstrate once again our profound determination to meet the threat of communism in the world.

The amendment to which I have referred has not been acted upon by the committee, but it will be offered before the bill is voted on. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a section which would provide:

Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as endorsing measures undertaken by the present Government of Yugoslavia which suppress or destroy religious, political, or economic liberty, and the Yugoslav Government shall be so notified when aid is furnished under this act.

That language has been approved by the Department of State, and I feel sure there can be no objection to it.

I very much hope that the Senate will pass the bill promptly, because it is extremely urgent that we act quickly. The President is deeply concerned, and those who are in responsible positions dealing with the subject urge its passage.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that should Russia decide to invade the western nations of Europe her natural, probable course would be through Yugoslavia?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot say that it would necessarily be the best course. It is one of the probable courses.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is one of the likely courses, at any rate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; because she would supposedly have the aid of her satellites in the areas which border Yugoslavia. She already has masses of troops stationed in Hungary and in other satellite countries on the borders of Yugoslavia, as a threat against Yugoslavia to make it comply with the wishes of the Cominform.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that, as he has announced, if anyone had told me a few months ago that I would be in favor of giving aid to Yugoslavia—

Mr. CONNALLY. Or to any Communist country.

Mr. McKELLAR. If anyone had told me that I would do it with respect to Yugoslavia or any other Communist country I am sure I would have objected very strenuously. I am utterly opposed to communism. I shall continue to oppose it. But under the conditions which now surround us, with threats of war all over the world, it seems to me that we must look to whatever other steps may be taken, and use every means to prevent the spread of war. I agree with the Senator's statement almost totally, if not quite totally.

I hope the Senate will pass this bill. So far as I am concerned, when the request comes before the Committee on Appropriations for an appropriation to carry out the purposes of the bill, I shall do everything I can to see that the appropriation is approved by that committee, and afterward by the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Did the Senator say that some other fund had already been provided for this purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is what is called an ad interim fund of only \$31,000,000. It is explained in the report of the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Has that all been spent?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that it has all been spent, but it has been provided.

Mr. STENNIS. It is in process of being spent?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. It is estimated that this additional sum will be required to carry out the full program. The report of the committee gives the details as to the \$31,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator think that the additional sum of \$38,000,000 will be sufficient to meet the present emergency?

Mr. CONNALLY. We think it will be sufficient until the next harvest. When the next harvest comes it will not be necessary to appropriate nearly so much, if anything. One of the most terrible droughts ever to visit Yugoslavia in all its history has devastated the food supplies of the country. There is great suffering in Yugoslavia even now.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the attitude of Tito, or what is the attitude of the people of Yugoslavia, toward this aid?

Mr. CONNALLY. They want it because they are hungry. The want it because they want to eat. Tito and his people have shown an increasing leaning toward the west. There has been an increasing expression of their interest in the west rather than in the east. But if we let some of them starve, they will fall into the lap of Russia and break away from the west.

Mr. STENNIS. Were there any expressions before the committee from the people?

Mr. CONNALLY. We had nothing direct. In the Washington Post of this morning there is something which is pretty close to the people. Reference is

made to a message from one of our diplomatic attachés who has been in Belgrade. It is on the front page of the Washington Post of this morning. Let me read from the front page of the Post:

THIRTY-TWO YUGOSLAV ARMY DIVISIONS HELD READY

NEW YORK, December 7.—R. Borden Reams, counselor at the United States Embassy in Belgrade, said today that anti-Cominform Yugoslavia had 32 army divisions available for immediate service.

Commenting on American aid to Marshal Tito's regime, Reams said:

"There isn't a better investment for us in the world today—dollar for dollar."

That answers the Senator's question. That is the view of Mr. Reams. He has been among the people. He states that there is not a better investment for us in the world today.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I notice that it is provided in the bill that there shall be continuous publicity through the press, radio, and other available media in Yugoslavia, for the assistance given by the United States. That raises in my mind the question of just what the people there are being told now.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what they are being told now, but it is being made clear to them what we are doing. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that they had already agreed to give full publicity to what we were doing. On November 10 Tito told Yugoslavia that no one would starve this winter because the United States was sending food to Yugoslavia. They have agreed to carry on a program of information to their people as to where the relief is coming from.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I think that is the important point in the whole program.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. After listening to the very persuasive statement of the Senator from Texas, it seems to me that we cannot fail to vote for this measure. However, I have been reading in the press of the very serious persecution and oppression of religion in Yugoslavia. I am wondering what the future attitude of that government is likely to be in reference to the religions which were or are being persecuted.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the testimony before the committee revealed that there is a swinging around on that question. This is the amendment which we propose to add to the bill:

Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as endorsing measures undertaken by the present Government of Yugoslavia which suppress or destroy religious, political, and economic liberty, and the Yugoslav Government shall be so notified when aid is furnished under this act.

That is an approach to the subject.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator. Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in subsection (b) of section 6 it is also pro-

vided that the aid will be terminated "whenever the Congress, by concurrent resolution of both Houses, finds termination is desirable."

Mr. CONNALLY. I invite the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee has just pointed out that the aid is terminable by means of a concurrent resolution of both Houses. So if there should be any abuse by Yugoslavia in regard to religious or civil liberties, we could immediately terminate the entire program.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a very wise provision.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that this appropriation is for the continuation of emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us how much aid has already been given to Yugoslavia, and in what form?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot tell the Senator how much of it has been spent, but a certain sum was made available. The Senator can obtain the information from the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have the information in the RECORD. If the report is not going into the RECORD, I should like to have the information stated for the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. On page 6 of the report are set forth the items already made available. I ask unanimous consent to have that statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Yugoslav emergency food program—stopgap program

Commodity	ECA (millions of dollars)	MDAP (millions of dollars)	Export-Import Bank (millions of dollars)	Total (millions of dollars)
Flour.....	12.2 (3.3)	3.6		15.8
Corn meal.....		.9		.9
Corn.....		.9		.9
Barley.....		1.7		1.7
Lard.....		2.1	3.2	5.3
Sugar.....		2.4		2.4
Beans.....			1.1 (2.3)	1.1
Dried eggs.....			5 (13.0)	.5
Canned meat.....			.4	.4
Subtotal.....	12.2 (3.3)	11.6	5.2 (15.3)	29.0 (18.6)
Ocean transport.....		2.0	.4	2.4
Total.....	12.2 (3.3)	13.6	5.6 (15.3)	31.4 (18.6)

¹ Includes ocean transport costs of replacement wheat to Italy and Germany. In the event that ECA is unable to supply the full 110,000 tons of flour, the deficiency will be made up by a drawing on MDA funds up to the extent of \$16,000,000.

² Estimated subsidy under wheat agreement on wheat replacement by ECA to Italy and Germany at current prices using 80 percent extraction rate.

³ Difference between USDA, CCC, investment cost and actual sales price at special, low, FAO price.

⁴ Difference between USDA, CCC, investment or acquisition cost and charge to program.

⁵ Assuming canned meat, dried eggs, some lard, and one-half of the dried beans shipped in Yugoslav vessels.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does that meet the wishes of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that according to the table, it seems to relate to the \$31,400,000 already appropriated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the \$31,400,000 is being provided as stopgap aid. It is largely transferred from the Export-Import Bank loan, and from ERP. The additional \$38,000,000 makes a total of \$69,400,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that. Will the Senator tell us about the \$31,400,000? How much of that is borrowed from the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that \$6,000,000 of a \$15,000,000 credit has been transferred for this purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. The details are set forth on page 5 of the report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a transfer from the authority under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. Part of the money is transferred from that authority.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was not present to listen to the entire discussion by the distinguished Senator from Texas. I am wondering if there would be any objection to placing the entire report in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. None at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that the entire report accompanying the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator wish the entire report printed?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it would be advisable.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection. There being no objection, the report, No. 2588, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration a proposal to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia, reports S. 4234, and recommends that it do pass.

1. MAIN PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed \$38,000,000, to the President to enable the United States to provide emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia. This assistance, most of which will be in the form of food, is being provided in order to assist the Yugoslav people to avoid economic havoc arising out of unusual drought conditions during 1950 and thereby to maintain their independence from the Soviet Union which can be expected to do its utmost to encourage the disintegration of an independent Yugoslavia.

Although this bill calls for aid to a Communist Yugoslavia which engages in many

practices that the free peoples of the world do not approve, the interests of the United States, the free world, and Yugoslavia coincide at this moment in history. Those interests coincide because of a common desire to prevent aggression, to stem the tide of Soviet imperialism wherever it may occur, and in this instance, in Yugoslavia in particular.

2. COMMITTEE ACTION

On December 4, 1950, the Committee on Foreign Relations heard witnesses in support of the recommendation of the President that the Congress enact legislation authorizing further United States assistance to meet the emergency created by the food shortage in Yugoslavia. The committee heard Mr. George W. Perkins, Assistant Secretary of State; Mr. John J. Haggerty, United States agricultural attaché in Belgrade; and Mr. Stanley Andrews, Director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture. These witnesses discussed drought conditions in Yugoslavia and the political implications of the proposed aid.

On December 5, the committee heard Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, testify in executive session in support of this legislation.

On December 6, 1950, the committee voted to report S. 4234 favorably to the Senate.

3. THE NEED FOR AID

The Soviet Yugoslav dispute: In order to assess the need for aid to Yugoslavia at this time and to see how giving that aid will be in the interest of the United States, one must examine the nature and extent of the break between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in 1948.

Prior to early 1948 the Yugoslav regime was, as one reporter wrote: "The toast of Moscow as the Soviet Union's lustiest offspring." * * * It was the biggest and in many respects the most vocal of the Soviet satellites. Its representatives echoed the Soviet line from the Danube to the United Nations. The headquarters of the Cominform (the Communist Information Bureau consisting of the Communist parties of various states), was in Belgrade.

Then came the break. During March, April, and May of 1948, Tito and Stalin in several exchanges of notes revealed fundamental differences between the Communist leaders of the Soviet Union and those of Yugoslavia.

In a note to Tito the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. reminded him of Trotsky and his fate. "When he decided to declare war on the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union)," said the note, "Trotsky also started with accusations of the CPSU as degenerate, as suffering from the limitations inherent in the narrow nationalism of great powers." The note added significantly, and perhaps as a warning, "We think that the political career of Trotsky is quite instructive." It will be recalled that Trotsky was assassinated in Mexico City where he was living in enforced exile.

A Cominform communiqué of June 28, 1948, read Tito's Communist Party out of the iron curtain in these words:

"The information bureau unanimously concludes that by their antiparty and anti-Soviet views, incompatible with Marxism-Leninism, by their whole attitude and their refusal to attend the meeting of the information bureau, the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have placed themselves in opposition to the Communist Parties affiliated to the information bureau, have taken the path of seceding from the united Socialist front against imperialism, have taken the path of betraying the cause of international solidarity of the working people, and have taken up a position of nationalism."

Permanence of split between Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.—Assistant Secretary of State George Perkins in commenting to the com-

mittee on this break between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia said:

"I know of no convincing evidence that the split between the government of Marshal Tito and the Kremlin is not genuine and is not permanent. Both the Marshal and the Kremlin have publicly proclaimed the irrevocability of the split and certainly there is nothing in Communist doctrine nor practice that I know of which would permit the Kremlin to take Marshal Tito back into the fold on any terms short of the grave."

The voting record of the Yugoslav delegation in the United Nations indicates the seriousness of the break. Prior to 1948 Yugoslavia always voted with the Soviet Union. Since then, Yugoslavia has shown increasing independence of the Soviet Union and on many occasions has taken positions in vigorous opposition. The Soviet imperialist attack on Korea seemed to be the occasion for an unqualified and vigorous stand by Yugoslavia against Soviet imperialism.

In a statement on September 8, 1950, the Yugoslav Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Kardelj, said:

"When considering the situation in Korea, the people of Yugoslavia cannot but do so in the light of the fact that for 3 years the Government of the Cominform, led by the Government of the Soviet Union, have been carrying on a violently aggressive campaign against Socialist Yugoslavia, precisely because the working people of Yugoslavia maintains its right to make its own decisions on its own soil. This aggressive policy, against which Socialist Yugoslavia has reacted very firmly, throws light on the policy pursued by its organizers in other parts of the world. It leaves no doubt that those who are still pursuing an aggressive and anti-Socialist policy toward Yugoslavia—a policy aimed at gaining supremacy for themselves—cannot be pursuing a different policy, a democratic and Socialist policy, a policy of peace and of the equality and brotherhood of all peoples, in other parts of the world. For a long time, the policy of the leaders of the Cominform has not coincided with the interests of the progress of mankind, and it is therefore harmful to all progressive and liberating movements which become its instruments.

"All their cries of loyalty to the cause of peace, and their accusations that others are aggressors will not suffice to cloak their share of responsibility for the Korean War and for the way in which they are endangering the peace of the world as a whole."

The attitude of the Yugoslav Government toward the west has changed for the better. Yugoslavia is now returning Greek children abducted during hostilities with Greece. Greece and Yugoslavia are renewing diplomatic relations. Yugoslavia is permitting people with Yugoslav nationality as well as American nationality to return to the United States if they wish. Relations between Italy and Yugoslavia have improved and Trieste is not the tinder box that it was 2 years ago. Relations between Austria and Yugoslavia have likewise been improving.

While the repressive measures of Tito toward the Yugoslav people and religious freedom find no defense in the United States, there have been indications recently that the requirements of support from the west may mean greater freedom for the people of Yugoslavia.

Economic warfare: Since 1948, the Soviet's war of nerves on Yugoslavia has been unremitting. It has been implemented by an economic boycott that has effectively interdicted trade between Yugoslavia and the iron curtain countries. In 1947, 49.1 percent of Yugoslavia's exports went to the Soviet bloc; in 1949, only 14.4 percent. The picture is much the same for imports. In 1947, 51.9 percent of Yugoslav imports came from the Soviet Union and the satellites; by 1949 imports from the Soviet states accounted for only 13.4 percent of Yugoslavia's

total imports. These figures show the terrific impact of the Soviet break upon the economy of Yugoslavia. Within 2 years it was necessary for Yugoslavia to reorientate her foreign trade from the east to the west. New markets had to be found for Yugoslav products; new sources of raw materials sought and means developed to pay for them.

The economic impact on Yugoslavia of this boycott as well as military moves by her satellite neighbors, and finally the show of Communist imperialist force in far-off Korea, all combined to put the Tito regime in a most precarious position—a position where Soviet Communists by subversion, coercion, or even military force might have brought Yugoslavia back into the Soviet fold.

The drought: Then came the drought. After heavy rains in February 1950, March showed rainfall of 63 percent of a 15-year average; April 84 percent of average; May 46 percent; June 21 percent; July 55 percent; August 12 percent; and September 37 percent. By then, what crops there were, were being harvested. The American agricultural attaché, Mr. John J. Haggerty, who during the past 2 years has traveled some 25,000 miles in Yugoslavia, reported that the drought effects were devastating. Corn failed to mature; wheat harvests were off.

The percentages in 1950 of 1947-49 average of certain commodities produced in Yugoslavia are as follows:

	Percent
Corn.....	59
Wheat.....	88
Rye.....	83
Barley.....	87
Oats.....	79
Rice.....	100
Vegetables and melons.....	57
Potatoes.....	67
Edible fats.....	88
Sugar.....	108
Beans.....	72
Peas.....	57

These figures do not tell the whole story, Yugoslavia normally has food enough to export and thereby acquire foreign exchange

with which to buy needed imports. One of the most telling effects of the drought was to reduce the ability of the Yugoslav people to import needed materials.

4. THE STOPGAP PROGRAM

During the summer months of 1950 it became apparent to American observers in Yugoslavia that that country was going to have great difficulty in avoiding economic collapse because of the drought. Economic collapse could only mean eventual resubjugation to Soviet imperialism. Nothing would have suited the Soviet better. Yugoslavia would then have become the first-class example of what happens to satellite states with nerve enough to break out of the Soviet orbit.

On October 20, 1950, the Yugoslav Government formally requested American assistance to meet the effects of the drought. That Government said it "has established by a careful examination of the damage incurred, that in spite of all efforts and an extreme limitation of the consumption, there still remains a loss amounting to \$105,000,000 that can be covered solely by extraordinary assistance from abroad."

After a careful examination of reports on conditions in Yugoslavia supplemented by eye-witness information from our agricultural attaché in Belgrade, and confirmed by American newspapermen, businessmen, and congressional visitors, the United States Government told the Yugoslav Government that it was prepared to take immediate steps to provide emergency foodstuffs to the people of that country. Immediate action was necessary so that maximum distribution could be undertaken before winter interfered with an inadequate transportation system. Accordingly, after informing certain congressional leaders of the conditions in Yugoslavia that made it necessary in our national interest to assist Yugoslavia, the President took steps to send foodstuffs to that country under existing authority. The following table indicates the source and nature of the commodities being shipped under the stopgap program:

Yugoslav emergency food program—stopgap program

Commodity	ECA (millions of dollars)	MDAP (millions of dollars)	Export-Import Bank (millions of dollars)	Total (millions of dollars)
Flour.....	12.2 ¹ (3.3)	3.6		15.8
Corn meal.....	.9	.9		.9
Corn.....	.9	.9		.9
Barley.....	1.7			1.7
Lard.....	2.1		3.2	5.3
Sugar.....	2.4			2.4
Beans.....			1.1 (2.3)	1.1
Dried eggs.....			3.5 (13.0)	.5
Canned meat.....			.4	.4
Subtotal.....	12.2 (3.3)	11.6	5.2 (15.3)	29.0 (18.6)
Ocean transport.....		2.0	.4	2.4
Total.....	12.2 (3.3)	13.6	5.6 (15.3)	31.4 (18.6)

¹ Includes ocean transport costs of replacement wheat to Italy and Germany. In the event that ECA is unable to supply the full 110,000 tons of flour, the deficiency will be made up by a drawing on MDA funds up to the extent of \$16 million.

² Estimated subsidy under wheat agreement on wheat replacement by ECA to Italy and Germany at current prices using 80% extraction rate.

³ Difference between USDA, CCC, investment cost and actual sales price at special, low, FAO price.

⁴ Difference between USDA, CCC, investment or acquisition cost and charge to program.

⁵ Assuming canned meat, dried eggs, some lard, and one-half of the dried beans shipped in Yugoslav vessels.

Authority for stopgap aid: According to information presented by the Department of State:

"The measures taken under this program (the stopgap program) were of a special nature and utilized existing legislative authority on an emergency basis for purposes not specifically contemplated when the laws in question were being considered by Congress."

The Department further described the authority for the stopgap program as follows:

"(a) The Export-Import Bank had already approved a \$15,000,000 credit to Yugoslavia

for export development programs. It was decided, however, to divert approximately \$6,000,000 of this credit in order to start food shipments immediately. In view of the fact that no appropriations for raw materials are being requested in the present program, it is considered necessary to utilize the remainder of the \$15,000,000 credit for raw materials, as well as spare parts and equipment, essential for the maintenance of the Yugoslav export industries.

"(b) The Economic Cooperation Act authorizes shipments of food to the European countries. It also recognizes that permission

may be given for transfers of material purchased with ERP funds, or similar materials, from participating countries to third countries. This authority was drawn upon to have flour shipped from Germany and Italy on the understanding that it would be replaced with wheat shipped from the United States to those countries. This unusual measure, which assists in the maintenance of stability of Yugoslavia, contributes to the over-all purposes of the European recovery program and is consistent with the established policy of encouraging exports by participating countries. Its prime purpose, however, is not one of the purposes of the programs contemplated when the ERP was last before Congress, and requires the participation of third countries in a way that makes its continuation undesirable.

"(c) Section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act permits the transfer of materials to European countries, other than those in the North Atlantic Treaty, under certain specified emergency conditions. These conditions were clearly present in the case of Yugoslavia, and therefore it was decided to provide foodstuffs to Yugoslavia only, however, in those quantities needed by the Yugoslav military forces.

"Yugoslavia is not a member of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, and therefore is not eligible for direct ERP aid. Up to now Yugoslavia has not indicated a willingness to become a member of the OEEC and assume the responsibilities under which it could qualify as a participating country and it is not considered advisable at this time to attempt to persuade it to do so. Similarly, Yugoslavia is not a party to the North Atlantic Treaty, and it is not expected to become a party.

"Consequently, it is appropriate and necessary, in view of the above considerations, to furnish such assistance to Yugoslavia, as will contribute to our purposes in the maintenance of peace, by means of special legislation for that end rather than by means of further emergency use of legislative authority not specifically intended to cover the contingencies which have arisen in connection with Yugoslavia."

5. THE PROPOSED PROGRAM

On November 29, 1950, the President recommended that Congress appropriate \$38,000,000 for the purchase of commodities to give Yugoslavia for emergency relief. The President's message explained that this amount would be in addition to the \$31,400,000 supplied on existing authority during the stopgap program. The total expenditures for commodities which would be supplied from the United States would be \$69,400,000.

The distribution of the proposed \$38,000,000, as well as the stopgap program of \$31,400,000, among commodities, is as follows:

Emergency aid to Yugoslavia

Commodity	Yugoslav request, market value (million dollars)	Total proposed program, estimated program expenditures (million dollars)	Stopgap program, estimated program expenditures (million dollars)	Authorization request, market value and estimated program expenditures (million dollars)
Wheat.....	14.1			
Wheat flour.....	4.5	18.7	15.8	2.9
Corn.....		.9	.9	
Corn.....	10.6	9.8	.9	8.9
Barley.....	2.7	2.7	1.7	1.0
Oats.....	4.8	4.8		4.8
Milo (fodder).....	2.6	2.6		2.6
Vegetables:				
Rice.....	6.9	1.1		1.1
Dried peas.....		3.0		3.0
Edible fats: Lard.....	14.3	7.1	5.3	1.8
Sugar.....	4.3	2.4	2.4	
Beans (dried).....	5.0	3.6	1.1	2.5

Emergency aid to Yugoslavia—Continued

Commodity	Yugoslav request, market value (million dollars)	Total proposed program, estimated program expenditures (million dollars)	Stopgap program, estimated program expenditures (million dollars)	Authorization request, market value and estimated program expenditures (million dollars)
Dried eggs.....	9.9	0.5	0.5	
Dried milk.....	1.8	1.8		1.8
Canned meat.....	.4	.4	.4	
Seeds.....	4.0	4.0		4.0
Subtotal.....	85.9	63.4	29.0	34.4
Ocean transportation.....		6.0	2.4	3.6
Total.....		69.4	31.4	38.0

Use of surplus supplies: Witnesses before the committee testified that although the funds actually to be spent on this program would total \$69,400,000, the market value of the foodstuffs supplied would be about \$75,000,000. About 71 percent of the foodstuffs in the stopgap and the proposed program are in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The only items that would be purchased in the open market are expected to be flour, lard, and rice and seeds.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE ALREADY PROVIDED TO YUGOSLAVIA BY THE UNITED STATES

The following table gives in outline form the major items of United States aid to Yugoslavia starting with wartime lend-lease and continuing up to the present:

Wartime:
 Plan A..... \$6,500,000
 Lend-lease..... \$32,125,000
 Postwar: 1945-47, UNRRA..... \$299,081,000

Since Cominform break:
 August 1949: National Security Council decision to approve export of steel mill.
 September 1949: Export-Import Bank..... 20,000,000
 March 1949: Export-Import Bank..... 20,000,000
 August 1949: Export-Import Bank..... 15,000,000

Other United States economic assistance:
 September 1949: United States support for \$3,000,000 International Monetary Fund drawing.

October 1949: United States support for International Bank \$2,700,000 loan, for timber equipment.

October 1949: United States support for \$6,000,000 IMF drawing.

December 1949: ECA authorizes off-shore purchases in Yugoslavia.

September 1949: United States support for West German credit to Yugoslavia of \$35,000,000.

¹United States portion of a joint United States, United Kingdom, Canadian postwar civilian relief to Yugoslavia from military supplies.

²All but \$75,000 during war.

³United States share of a total amount of \$430,000,000 provided by UNRRA.

6. ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM

Since this is an emergency-relief program that will come to an end with the crop harvest in the spring and summer of 1951, it was not deemed advisable to create a complicated administrative mechanism for operation of the program. The draft bill provides (sec. 4) that the President may transfer aid funds to any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government for expenditure under the terms of the law. It is the intention of the executive branch to continue to

operate the program authorized by this legislation in much the same way as the stopgap program has been administered. That means the principal operating responsibility in the United States will be in the Department of State. The actual procurement and shipment of aid will be carried on by existing procurement agencies, principally the CCC and the Department of Agriculture.

Responsibility at the Belgrade end of the operation will be in the hands of the American Ambassador to Yugoslavia. He will have, with the assistance of a small staff recruited for this purpose, responsibility for seeing that the conditions of aid set forth in section 3 of the bill, and such other conditions as the President finds desirable and appropriate, are met by the Yugoslav Government.

Since the stopgap program has been quickly and efficiently administered by existing agencies with existing personnel, the committee saw no reason to change that setup.

7. CONDITIONS OF AID

As indicated earlier, the motivation for aid to Yugoslavia, while partly humanitarian, is dictated largely by the coincidence in the national interests of the United States and Yugoslavia in maintaining the independence of Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, the legislation sets forth certain minimum conditions which are to be satisfied before any aid authorized is made available to Yugoslavia. Those conditions are set forth in section 3 of the bill. They follow in a general way the pattern of other aid legislation passed by the Congress during recent years.

Publicity: Provision is made that "full and continuous publicity" is to be given by Yugoslavia to the aid furnished by the United States and that the Yugoslav Government must permit observers to see and report on the distribution of aid made available under the act. The arrival of the first shipment in the stopgap program received extensive press and radio coverage in Yugoslavia.

Equitable distribution: Yugoslavia is required to agree to make equitable distribution of the commodities supplied without discrimination as to race, color, or political or religious belief.

Local currency: The legislation also requires Yugoslavia to make local currency available in amounts sufficient to meet the local expenses incurred by the United States in connection with the aid furnished. At the suggestion of the committee, provision was also made that, to the extent the Government of Yugoslavia sells commodities furnished by the United States, it is to provide an equivalent amount of local currency to be available for such purposes as the United States and Yugoslavia may agree upon. Mention is made of the possibility of using such sums for relief to needy persons and children and for charitable or medical purposes.

Finally, the President is authorized to require from Yugoslavia such other undertakings as he finds desirable and appropriate as conditions of aid.

8. OTHER AID FOR YUGOSLAVIA

The Yugoslav Government has tightened its belt. It is not relying solely on what other governments can do to help it. Orders have been issued limiting domestic use of scarce foodstuffs and imported items. Severe criminal penalties are provided for persons who disobey those orders. On September 27, 1950, an order was issued with a preamble as follows:

"On account of the reduction in the yield of agricultural products, caused by drought, and in order to insure food for the population, preserve the livestock, find and successfully carry out the economic and other plans in the coming year, all competent government agencies are obligated to undertake special measures for the realization of these tasks, etc."

The Italian and German Governments assisted the stopgap program by sending food grains and sugar to Yugoslavia. The United Kingdom has offered a credit of £3,000,000 for Yugoslavia to purchase food and consumer goods. Other countries in the North Atlantic area which are vitally concerned with the continued independence of Yugoslavia are considering what steps they can take to give assistance.

9. THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROBLEM

The President in his message to Congress set forth the policy of this Government with respect to Yugoslavia in these words:

"Since the break between the Kremlin and Yugoslavia, it has been the policy of this Government to assist Yugoslavia to maintain its independence. The continued independence of Yugoslavia is of great importance to the security of the United States and its partners in the North Atlantic Organization, and to all nations associated with them in their common defense against the threat of Soviet aggression."

The United States Government is unalterably opposed to international communism wherever it exists and therefore would like to see the people of Yugoslavia free to choose their own political institutions. While it may seem then that the United States should not give assistance to the Communist Government of Yugoslavia, the fact is that help is being given Yugoslavia because Yugoslavia puts independence from Communist imperialism ahead of subservience to international communism. Tito espouses nationalist communism rather than imperialist communism, which seeks to bind all Communists to the Kremlin. Soviet imperialist communism seeks to rob all states of their independence. Titoism seeks the independence of Communist states from Soviet dictatorship.

The Yugoslav break with the Soviet bloc was a decided setback to Soviet expansionism. The western powers must exploit this break, not because they want to help communism in Yugoslavia, but because they want to encourage other Communist states to throw off the yoke of the Kremlin and to choose a free government. Yugoslavia may not be a recruit for democracy, but it is a recruit for the principle of independence.

10. THE MILITARY IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROGRAM

On November 20, 1950, a United States note to the Yugoslav Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs set forth the agreed basis whereby certain funds from the Mutual Defense Assistance Act were to be made available as a part of the stopgap program for assistance to the military forces of Yugoslavia. That note reads in part as follows:

"Our two Governments are both desirous of fostering international peace and security within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations through measures which will further the ability of nations dedicated to the purposes and principles of the Charter to participate effectively in arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in support of those purposes and principles.

"Accordingly, I am pleased to inform you that my Government is prepared, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 329, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, to supply assistance in aid of food requirements of the armed forces of your Government on the following mutually agreed basis that:

"(1) Your Government will use the assistance exclusively for the purpose for which it is furnished, namely, in furtherance of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, to prevent the weakening of the defenses of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

"(2) That your Government agrees not to transfer to any other nation the assistance furnished pursuant to this agreement without the prior consent of this Government.

"(3) That your Government will provide the United States with reciprocal assistance by continuing to facilitate the production and transfer to the United States, in such quantities and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed on, of raw and semiprocessed materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources and which may be available in Yugoslavia. Arrangements for such transfers shall give due regard to requirements for domestic use and commercial export of Yugoslavia.

"(4) That your Government is prepared to make available to the Government of the United States of America dollars for the use of the United States of America for any administrative expenditures within Yugoslavia in connection with assistance furnished by the United States of America to Yugoslavia arising out of this agreement. Our two Governments will at the appropriate time initiate discussion with a view to determining the amount of such dollars and to agree upon arrangements for the furnishing of such dollars."

Yugoslav military strength

The Yugoslav Army of more than 30 divisions at this time is the largest army in western Europe outside of the Soviet Union. Its troops established their fighting ability during the war with Germany. Their forces plus those of other independent states of southeast Europe would, if the Soviet Union should use force to wreak its will on western Europe, constitute a bastion of strength. To fail at this time to help any one of these states to retain its independence would be to overlook a source of strength for the defense of the free world which western Europe and the United States could ill afford to lose.

11. SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR AIDING YUGOSLAVIA

1. The Government of Yugoslavia has successfully broken away from the domination of the Kremlin. The rift between the Communist regimes of Moscow and Belgrade seems to be deep and unbridgeable.

2. Drought conditions in Yugoslavia during the past year in combination with economic difficulties arising from the break with the Soviet bloc, have threatened the economic collapse of Yugoslavia.

3. The economic collapse of Yugoslavia would presage overthrow of the Tito government and the enforced return of that country to the Soviet fold.

4. It is in the interests of the United States and the free nations of the world to assist any state in maintaining its independence, particularly from the domination of Moscow.

5. The strength of the Yugoslav Army is such that it might well be a crucial factor in the defense of western Europe in the event of Soviet aggression.

6. The United States has always maintained that nations should be free to determine their own form of government even though the United States may not like that form of government. Soviet imperialism has always sought to impose its form of government and its direction on independent states whenever possible. Assistance to Yugoslavia will assist her in maintaining that independence.

It is the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the United States Government should provide emergency aid to Yugoslavia to enable that country to meet food shortages arising out of the 1950 drought and thereby stave off the threat of Soviet imperialism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. There seems to be rather a strain in the authority, in taking this form of action in connection with the Export-Import Bank. Did the committee go into that question?

Mr. CONNALLY. A strain in the authority?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; that it was somewhat beyond the contemplated scope of the Export-Import Bank's authority. Has there been any precedent for giving aid of this character by the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a loan, is it not?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not understand it is.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Export-Import Bank makes loans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee took testimony as to that. It was a transaction between the Export-Import Bank and Yugoslavia. The bank had already approved a \$15,000,000 credit to Yugoslavia, and agreed that \$6,000,000 could be diverted to the purchase of food rather than some kind of raw material.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there any precedent for that precise type of loan by the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We had nothing to do with that. We had no testimony as to that point, to my knowledge.

Mr. BREWSTER. In cases of mutual-defense aid to other countries funds have been diverted, but it is true, is it not, that Yugoslavia is not a member of any of the groups contemplated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true. But there was a reservation in the act for a certain percentage of the aid granted to be used in emergency conditions, which was not allocated for Yugoslavia. It was my understanding that when we passed the act we certainly anticipated it could be used, for example, in Austria, which was not a party to the treaty.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has Yugoslavia undertaken any of the obligations associated with any of the countries that are parties to either the mutual-defense agreement or the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. BREWSTER. If we are relying upon this military aid, why do we not have some kind of obligation on their part that they will come to our aid if we need aid? I think it is about time we should find whether we can secure any help from these people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Personally I would say it was premature to make that a matter of any public negotiation.

Mr. BREWSTER. We have with respect to all the other countries, have we not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a great difference.

Mr. BREWSTER. And even they are slow in coming to our aid when we need it now. But in this case we have not even an obligation on the part of Yugoslavia.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will have to reclaim the floor. We could not afford, in granting aid to feed hungry people, to provide that the price of our aid is that the recipients must fight with us. That will follow. If we were to

make such a provision we would be branded throughout the world as having bribed Yugoslavia.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not about time that we obtain a little something in return for our "bribes?" I think the American people are coming to wonder when some of these countries are going to begin to pay off when we need them.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is very difficult.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that the first installment of this aid of food was to go to feed the army, not the hungry people? Is that not true?

Mr. CONNALLY. The army is hungry just like everybody else.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator think the army is as hungry as the poor peasants?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not been in Yugoslavia recently. I was there some years ago. If the Senator will read the committee report I believe he will be satisfied. And he can read the debate as it will be printed in the Record in the morning.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have read the report. I have not seen the printed testimony before the committee. I understand it is not available.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall read from the report what the State Department says. The report says:

Authority for stopgap aid: According to information presented by the Department of State:

"The measures taken under this program (the stopgap program) were of a special nature and utilized existing legislative authority on an emergency basis for purposes not specifically contemplated when the laws in question were being considered by Congress."

Mr. BREWSTER. Does that mean that it was outside the contemplation of the act?

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, it was not in view. It may have been outside. I read further from the report:

The Department further described the authority for the stopgap program as follows: "(a) The Export-Import Bank had already approved"—

Now if the Senator from Maine will pay heed—

"The Export-Import Bank had already approved a \$15,000,000 credit to Yugoslavia for export development programs."

That is what the Senator from Arkansas was referring to. He referred to the fact that the Export-Import Bank had already approved the credit of \$15,000,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. For development purposes, which is the contemplation of the Export-Import Bank. What I asked was if there was any precedent for aid of this character being extended by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is often no precedents for anything that happens.

Mr. BREWSTER. We are establishing a precedent now for the Export-Import Bank to start a program of this character which is certainly utterly outside of anything that was contemplated.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator talks about precedent. Everything has got to

happen once. It has got to happen once before it is a precedent.

Mr. BREWSTER. That does not prove it is good.

Mr. CONNALLY. We may be making a precedent. I do not have to have a precedent for everything I do. I should like to make some more precedents.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let us have a precedent which gets us a little help from somewhere. Would not such a precedent be a good one?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, of course, it would. We will get it in due time.

Mr. BREWSTER. The time is pretty late.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question is, Are they able to do it? Does the Senator want a crippled man to lift him over the fence?

Let me read further:

"It was decided, however, to divert approximately \$6,000,000 of this credit in order to start food shipments immediately."

The bank has already approved a credit of \$15,000,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. They are going to divert a part of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me read this sentence.

"It was decided, however, to divert approximately \$6,000,000 of this credit in order to start food shipments immediately."

The concern was with starvation. Food was needed. The bank saw an opportunity temporarily to divert a part of the credit which had already been approved, to be used for food to save starving people. A brief moment ago the Senator from Maine was appealing for the poor peasants who were hungry and starving, yet he does not want to give them anything except to set aside \$6,000,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator from Texas will permit me, there is nothing to indicate that anybody in Yugoslavia will do any starving in the next few months. If the Senator will read his own records and his own reports showing the production of Yugoslavia he will find that it is perfectly evident that there is no occasion whatsoever for starvation now or for the next 3 or 4 months.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to say that the last statement by the Senator from Maine is entirely without any foundation whatever. The evidence before the committee was that Yugoslavia has suffered the most serious drought in her history. We had our own agricultural attaché there, who impressed the committee as being an extremely able gentleman. Everyone had that impression. He had gone out and personally talked to the people. He happens to be one who can talk to the people. He went all over Yugoslavia. He said the present food shortage situation is the most serious they have ever faced. The Sena-

tor is entirely mistaken if he believes Yugoslavia is not faced with a serious food shortage immediately.

I should like to draw the Senator's attention to two facts. The Senator said that nothing is agreed to by the Yugoslavs. I draw his attention to page 9 of the report, at the bottom thereof. There he will find several agreements.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. Everything except—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have the regular order?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator thinks that in all agreements of this kind every factor we expect to come about must be set down in black and white, I think he is simply unrealistic about the ways of international relations, because here is a country which is struggling for its existence, separate from Russia, and the fact that they have already made the break, that they have already broken away from Russia, that they have 30 military divisions, and that they exist separate from Russian domination, is sufficient to warrant the statement that was made here a moment ago that this would be the best investment of our money that we could make. They do not have to fight to be worth every bit of this.

General Bradley and others advised us that the mere existence of 30 divisions on the flank of Russia is worth a great deal to us, whether they ever fight anybody or not. But they are there, ready and able to fight if they are disturbed. It is not a part of this agreement that they agree to attack anybody. But what is important to us is that they be maintained in an independent posture and be able to fight. That is sufficient justification. I certainly do not think we ought to even request that they agree to attack anybody. We do not know whom we are going to attack. Nobody knows what the future will bring. But it is extremely important that they be maintained as an independent country— independent I mean of Russia.

Before I conclude, I should like to say that the authority under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 is set forth on page 15 of the hearings. If the Senator from Maine is interested in it, he will find that there is specific authority for the use of 10 percent of the fund appropriated for aid there for just such an emergency.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, allow me in conclusion to make a statement in reply to the interrogatory of the Senator from Maine, "What are we going to get out of this? How much shall be placed on the barrel head? What are we going to get?" and so on. General Bradley was before our committee and he testified strongly in favor of the bill on the very grounds pointed out by the Senator from Arkansas. There is not involved any direct promise by Yugoslavia to fight when we fight. But the mere existence of 32 divisions, armed and equipped, in that area which would no doubt be a vulnerable area otherwise, is a great guaranty, it is a great assurance, it is a great security against invasions by Communist forces from Russia or elsewhere.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. To what extent did the committee take evidence from General Bradley and others as to the equipment of these divisions?

Mr. CONNALLY. We had evidence on the subject, and it ought to be available to the Senator from Maine, because somebody in the committee gave out something about it, and it is published in the newspapers in extenso. General Bradley had to complain that he could not testify freely before a committee, because what he said would be placarded on the highways and byways on the following day.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the information available to the Senate, on which this was predicated?

Mr. CONNALLY. On which what was predicated?

Mr. BREWSTER. The equipment of these divisions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; we had testimony on that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the printed evidence available to the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it was in executive session.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is not available, then.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have it in the committee. If the Senator is interested he can read it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not for publication.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it is not for publication.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that the committee was satisfied that these divisions were something more than skeletons?

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely.

Mr. BREWSTER. Something more than inadequately equipped?

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely they are not inadequately equipped.

The committee was satisfied and reported the bill to the Senate. It is up to the Senate to decide whether it wishes to pass the bill or to reject it. I have done all I could along these lines.

I submit that the bill is a wise and courageous measure not only for humanitarian purposes but for our own defense and security and to encourage those in that area who disagree with communism to stand up and take a position alongside the western nations who stand for liberty and freedom.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the total amount of appropriations that will be forthcoming if this measure is passed?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean the \$31,000,000 which has already been authorized?

Mr. WHERRY. The measure now before us is an authorization, I take it, for a further sum.

Mr. CONNALLY. This measure carries an authorization of \$38,000,000; in addition to \$31,000,000 which has been authorized or directed or diverted from other funds. However, the authorization provided in the pending measure is \$38,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that I may understand the amount of the authorization proposed, let me say that I understand that the amount which already has been spent is authorized under the 10-percent clause of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. I refer to the provision of that act with respect to emergencies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; a part of it is diverted from an Export-Import Bank loan which already has been granted. Ten percent of the amount is authorized under section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. Does the Senator wish me to read that section?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I simply wish to have the authority clearly in the minds of those of us who will have to vote on this matter, in order to justify the making of the remainder of the appropriation. I know that approximately \$6,000,000 which has been used has been taken from the Export-Import Bank loan for which authority already has been provided.

A short time ago, in the course of the colloquy between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Texas referred to the authorization under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. How much money was used in that connection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Thirteen million six hundred thousand dollars and twelve million two hundred thousand dollars under the ECA Act. Wheat is one commodity which has been provided. For example, I believe that Germany and Italy have agreed that the wheat they already have can be used for this purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that the Administrator of ECA has authority to allocate those funds.

Mr. WHERRY. The purpose was to get food to Yugoslavia expeditiously, as I understand. Under the ECA Act, Germany and Italy were entitled to certain funds, and I understand that the necessary funds for aid to Yugoslavia have been borrowed from the funds available for Germany and Italy, and have been used for the purchase of flour which has been sent to Yugoslavia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the authority had by the ECA permit the use of that flour for shipment to Yugoslavia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that it does.

Mr. WHERRY. In what way?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The ECA aid was made available under sections 111 and 115 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. What is that provision? When we have that information, we shall have a statement of the entire authority for this matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Administrator of ECA has the widest authority in respect to allocations and reallocations.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I am simply asking about the authority to extend that aid to Yugoslavia. Is that set forth in the report?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yugoslavia is not mentioned in the ECA Act, but that act gives the Administrator wide authority.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that. However, I should like very much to have the RECORD show, if possible, upon what the ECA relied for that authority. When that authority is set forth in the RECORD, that point will be cleared up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not happen to place that section verbatim in the report, but I do happen to have before me the verbatim section of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will put in the RECORD, first, an explanation of the approximately \$6,000,000 coming from the Export-Import Bank, and will explain, in that connection, that they have operated under authority to use it; second, that under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act they have had so much money, which has been authorized, and under that authorization they have extended aid.

I know that under the ECA Act there have been broad powers to make transfers. However, speaking for myself, let me say that I did not know that they could extend the aid to any country outside of the 16 countries mentioned. Perhaps that could be done; I simply do not recall it. However, if there is authority for that, I wish the Senator would point it out.

Then we come down to the authorization which it is proposed to make now. I understand that the authorization is proposed to be made in the amount of \$38,000,000; and that authorization, if made by the Senate, will be placed before the Appropriations Committee as a justification for a subsequent appropriation.

Are not those the approximate mechanics of this matter?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the members of the Foreign Relations Committee will give the Appropriations Committee that information, because it will make it very much easier to get the money appropriated if those facts are before us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Texas yield further? I do not wish to detain him.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is quite all right; I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas some questions. I do not wish to detain the Senator from Texas, if he wishes to be seated.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Among the ECA releases which come to our offices, the last one I have is under date of November 28.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I think the Senator from Nebraska asked a very pointed question, but I did not hear the answer. The question was, By what authority was the \$12,000,000 transferred from ECA funds?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point the distinguished Senator from Arkansas assured me he would cover. He said that had been authorized under the provisions of the ECA Act, and he is going to supply that authorization for the RECORD, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have looked in vain for that authorization, and I should like to have it pointed out.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that it will be provided for the Record.

I understood the Senator to say that the agreements which have been entered into have been published in the report. That may be. However, in the ECA release under date of November 28 of this year the following is stated:

Under the agreement entered into with the Government of Yugoslavia officials of the United States Government and representatives of the United States press will be permitted to observe freely the receipt and the distribution of all assistance made available, with a view to noting that it is equitably distributed among the population of Yugoslavia—

And so forth. I should like to ask either the distinguished Senator from Texas or the distinguished Senator from Arkansas whether the agreements which are mentioned in the report are available to Members of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That particular agreement is referred to in the bill itself. What I was referring to a moment ago appears on page 9 of the report.

Mr. WHERRY. I find this statement:

Under the agreement entered into with the Government of Yugoslavia—

Of course, that was prior to this time—officials of the United States—

And so forth and so on. Have agreements been entered into between our Government and the Government of Yugoslavia relative to this aid or something upon which the granting of this aid hinges?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe this answers the Senator's question:

On November 20, 1950, a United States note to the Yugoslav Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs set forth the agreed basis whereby certain funds from the Mutual Defense Assistance Act were to be made available as a part of the stopgap program of military assistance to Yugoslavia. That note is the basis of the conditions and agreements for supplying all the aid which heretofore has been given.

It is contemplated that if we pass this measure an executive agreement will be made with the Yugoslav Government incorporating the provisions of this act—in other words, providing for freedom of movement, for observation, for the use of any counterpart funds which may arise, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my second point. I should like to see the agreement, if that is possible. I am interested only in the mechanics of this matter.

Under the agreement are counterpart funds being used?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me start over again: As to the money which has been transferred from the funds available under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, there was a note—which constitutes, I think, an executive agreement with Yugoslavia—relating to that aid.

If we pass this measure, authorizing \$38,000,000 more, a new and additional executive agreement will have to be made to cover this aid.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. That is the basis of the question I am asking.

In the case of the agreement or the note the Senator mentioned first, is that the agreement which is mentioned in the ECA release to which I have referred?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know about the release. That is the agreement on page 9 of the report.

Mr. WHERRY. That has to do with the relief.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what release the Senator from Nebraska has.

Mr. WHERRY. It is printed on a page carrying the letterhead of the ECA. This release was issued on November 28. It calls attention to an agreement made between the United States and Yugoslavia. I am asking whether that agreement is available and what it contains, if it is permissible for that information to be published.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I know is the part which appears on page 9 of the report. On page 9, toward the bottom of the page, we find these words:

That note reads in part as follows—

And at that point there appears in the report most of the note, I assume, at least.

Mr. WHERRY. That is in the report, is it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, on page 9.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the only agreement in this connection which the Senator from Arkansas knows anything about; is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska, if I may do so, to a portion of the report appearing near the bottom on page 5, where a part of the statement made by the State Department is set forth. I read from that portion of the report:

(c) Section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act permits the transfer of materials to European countries, other than those in the North Atlantic Treaty, under certain specified emergency conditions. These conditions were clearly present in the case of Yugoslavia, and therefore it was decided to provide foodstuffs to Yugoslavia only, however, in those quantities needed by the Yugoslav military forces.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the majority leader for his statement, but that really does not answer my question. I realize now that there have been exchanges between Yugoslavia and the United States, or some intermediary, relative to the need, and our supplying the need. All I am asking is, Was there any agreement entered into between the United States and Yugoslavia, of which this might be a condition? Let us forget the aid now. If there was such an agreement, I was merely wondering whether it had been introduced in evidence, and whether it was presented to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This part was presented.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the only part the Senator knows about, is it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator feels that possibly that is the agreement which was just mentioned here in this discussion, does he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me call attention to the fact that on page 5 of the report, in subparagraph (b), it is stated:

The Economic Cooperation Act authorizes shipments of food to the European countries. It also recognizes that permission may be given for transfers of material purchased with ERP funds, or similar materials, from participating countries to third countries.

That is, they may be transferred to countries which are not participating at all. That is made very clear. I read further from the same paragraph:

This authority was drawn upon to have flour shipped from Germany and Italy on the understanding that it would be replaced with wheat shipped from the United States to those countries.

In other words, we were going to allocate to those countries certain amounts of wheat, but, in consideration of their releasing the flour, it would be replaced by wheat later on. Reading further from the same paragraph:

This unusual measure, which assists in the maintenance of stability of Yugoslavia, contributes to the over-all purposes of the European recovery program and is consistent with the established policy of encouraging exports by participating countries. Its prime purpose, however, is not one of the purposes of the programs contemplated when the ERP was last before Congress, and requires the participation of third countries in a way that makes its continuation undesirable.

Mr. WHERRY. The Administrator has that authority now, has he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. He has.

Mr. WHERRY. He could transfer funds or materials from any country that he might choose?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the same release, which is available to Members of the Senate, on page 2, in next to the last paragraph, this statement is made to which I should like the Senator from Arkansas particularly to listen, as I know he has been very busy in connection with the bill. I read:

President Truman last week—

And this was issued on November 28—

President Truman last week announced that the United States Government, under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, would also provide \$16,000,000 worth of food to Yugoslavia for use of that country's armed forces.

Is that a part of this appropriation, or is it an additional amount that is to be granted? If so, under what authority will that be granted? It refers here to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What was the amount?

Mr. WHERRY. It says here \$16,000,000. I shall be glad to hand the release to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is the same amount.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the one we are talking about?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is the amount.

Mr. WHERRY. We do not find in the report the same amounts that are in this release.

Mr. CONNALLY. That refers to the military, does it not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is for the Armed Forces. That would be a part of the \$31,400,000, would it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so. Let me read from page 15 of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House bill 9853, as follows:

On November 22, 1950, the President notified the Committee on Foreign Affairs of his decision to utilize the provisions of section 408 (c) to give aid to Yugoslavia. The committee was informed that the amount to be used would not exceed \$16,000,000.

I think that is the same amount.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Before the Senator from Texas yields the floor, I desire to say this. If there is any other agreement with Yugoslavia—and I do not limit it to an agreement to render aid—provided it is not secret, for if it is information which should not be made public I would not want it; but if it is available and can be made public, I should like to have it, because I feel that it might help establish the authority and justification for the remaining \$38,000,000 when it comes before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator that I cannot give him information which would enable him to dot every "i" and cross every "t." I may say, however, that Yugoslavia was most willing to make these general agreements, and I have no doubt that she will keep them.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no question about that, and I am in no way impugning the motives of the distinguished chairman or of any other member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested only in this agreement. If the agreement is merely the one mentioned by the Senator from Arkansas, which has to do with the transfer of flour, I think we have a pretty good conception of what was in the committee's mind. There was first the \$6,000,000 which was granted by the Export-Import Bank. Second, there was the authority contained in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, to the extent of 10 percent. Then, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the distinguished Senator from Texas have pointed out in the report that the ECA may permit the transfer of material purchased with ERP funds, or similar materials, from participating countries to third countries; and, under that program, \$11,500,000 has been transferred; is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Eleven million dollars.

Mr. CONNALLY. Eleven million dollars. The Senator from Nebraska said \$11,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. In these times, I may say to the Senator, billions of dollars do not mean much more than millions; but I shall make the RECORD correct by saying \$11,000,000. I have just received

these figures, but I believe I have them straight in my thinking now. The Appropriations Committee, I understand, will have before it a request for an appropriation in the amount of \$38,000,000, which will complete the entire transaction, totaling about how many million dollars?

Mr. CONNALLY. Seventy million dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it about \$70,000,000?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is \$69,400,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the Senator from Arkansas for the computation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I yield the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I desire to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am yielding to the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I certainly rise only to speak in support of the bill which is in charge of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I should like to ask the chairman whether he has formally offered the amendment which he read to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not formally present it, but I read it and stated that we would offer it as an amendment to appear at the end of the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Texas permit me to be associated with him in the offering of the amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to do so.

Mr. McMAHON. Then, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] I now submit the amendment.

The amendment submitted by Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. CONNALLY) is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as endorsing measures undertaken by the present Government of Yugoslavia which suppress or destroy religious, political, or economic liberty, and the Yugoslav Government shall be so notified when aid is furnished under this act."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I withheld my vote of approval in the Foreign Relations Committee when the committee voted approval on this authorization day before yesterday. I did so, not because I was opposed to the authorization, but because, before I registered my formal consent, I wanted an opportunity to review the correspondence which has passed between the State Department and our Ambassador in Yugoslavia concerning the application for aid, and also I wished to review for myself the representations which had been made by our Department of State to our Ambassador regarding the internal conditions of Yugoslavia.

I, of course, find it impossible to forget that it was Tito who shot down American flyers only a few years ago. I do not

overlook the fact that he, in the Communist tradition, has persecuted religious persons, has been anti-Christ and anti-God, has suppressed freedom of speech, has suppressed freedom of assembly, and freedom of worship.

However, Mr. President, we are faced with a condition. A million people are faced with the threat of starvation. I think it is important that the people of Yugoslavia know that we are proffering aid which God in his wisdom has granted to us in abundance, and that we are granting our aid primarily because these people are in distress.

I am particularly impressed by the fact that those who drafted the proposed legislation saw fit to include in it the provision which makes it mandatory for the administrators of our aid to make the people of Yugoslavia realize the spirit in which we offer it.

I am, of course, not unconscious either, of the effect that giving this aid will have on the future security of the United States. I believe that our security would be enhanced and improved if Tito were to take to heart the provisions of this bill, particularly the provisions of the amendment which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has offered to the bill. It is my belief that Tito will secure that kind of unity in Yugoslavia which will enable him more readily to resist foreign domination and aggression, if he grants to his own people the basic freedoms and basic liberties from which must flow a greater unity within that country.

So, Mr. President, I support the authorization and I hope that the Committee on Appropriations, as soon as the bill becomes law, will follow with an appropriation, so that we may proceed to the completion of this business. Then I believe that the administrators of the program on behalf of the United States should make certain that the people of Yugoslavia are under no misapprehension as to our attitude, and that the fact that we come to the aid of people in distress is not to be taken, in the words of this amendment, as any approval of the kind of suppression, the kind of ruthlessness, and the kind of brutality which Tito has evidenced in the past.

I may say in closing that there is some indication, I am happy to see, of a great consciousness in the Yugoslavian Government's mind of the impossibility of the persecution of her own people, and a realization that such persecution is not consonant with the continuation of sovereignty and the exercise thereof in their hands. I am hopeful that the authorization which would give aid to Yugoslavia will be the prelude to a further widening and further liberalization of Yugoslavia's attitude with regard to the rights of individuals, which come not from men but come from God.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I had not anticipated that this bill would be called up for consideration by the Senate this afternoon. I see that the report of the committee is dated December 7. I understand that the record of the hearings held by the committee has not been printed, and therefore is not available to the Members of this body.

If for the moment we indulge in the assumption that the bill should be passed, that support of it is fully justified, and that it is the wise course for our country to pursue, it does not follow that Members of the Senate—and I speak for myself—have yet had an opportunity to become familiar with all the facts and reasons which are being advanced in support of the measure and why funds should be made available to the Government of Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I can very well preface my remarks by adopting the sentiments expressed by the very able Senator from Texas the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY] and by the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]—and I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations—that if someone had said to me some months ago that I, or any other Member of this body, would be standing on the floor of the Senate this afternoon pleading for aid and assistance to Yugoslavia, I, too, would have called him to order and repudiated any such implications.

Mr. President, the only difference between the able Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, on the one hand, and myself, on the other, is that I have not changed my mind. I am of that opinion still. I do not say that I could not be convinced of the wisdom of the suggested course. Perhaps I could be. However, until I am convinced, I shall not vote to authorize an appropriation that I am not prepared to vote for. I cannot, at this moment, according to my best judgment, agree to recommend appropriations to carry out the provisions of this act.

For that reason, Mr. President, if a vote is taken on the measure today, before there has been adequate opportunity to study the testimony which the committee heard, and to weigh all the factors involved, I shall be compelled to cast my vote against the bill.

Mr. President, I have this difficulty. It makes a tremendous humanitarian appeal when it is reported that thousands of people are facing or suffering hunger, and possibly starvation. Regardless of what part of the world such people are in, or of what nationality they may be, the generous spirit of America has prompted us in the past to come to their assistance and we have relieved the distress of humanity in almost every area of the globe during the course of the history of our Nation.

Mr. President, since the end of World War II we have undertaken to rehabilitate the war-devastated countries, and particularly the free nations and the free peoples. We have done so not only for those who were our allies during the war, but even for those who were our enemies in the conflict. To date, Mr. President, we have spent, as I recall, more than \$30,000,000,000 in that great effort of human endeavor and sympathy, because we felt that we were more blessed or more fortunate than other nations, and that since we were all now striving—or we all thought that we were all striving—in this postwar era for the achieve-

ment of a lasting and durable peace, we could well afford, not only from an economic standpoint but from a standpoint of human fellowship, to make such expenditures; and to make them even at the cost of burdening our own economy, our own National Treasury, and our taxpayers, in deficit spending. We have done that in order to try to meet a condition which needed our assistance, in the hope and in the belief that those who were the recipients of our assistance would be grateful for our efforts.

Mr. President, the situation has changed. The argument that if we will give assistance to Yugoslavia we may have her help later in speculation and conjecture of the highest order.

Mr. President, a Communist is a Communist. Communist ideology is diametrically opposed to everything that America has stood for from its beginning, and it is opposed to everything that every real red-blooded American stands for today. Not one thing has happened which could possibly recommend to Congress any possible excuse for the proposed authorization other than to try to disburse relief to some people who are in distress. Why we should take this course and expect any benefit to flow to us from it can only be predicated on the hypothesis that at the moment Tito and Stalin are in a quarrel. Yes; someone suggests, "maybe." How do we know? Who can vouch for it? We are asked to guess. We are asked to tax the American people more and go further into deficit spending on the doubtful hypothesis that possibly some day we would find Tito's government and his army fighting on our side.

Mr. President, I have no confidence that that will ever happen. It is within the range of possibility, of course, that if Yugoslavia were attacked by the forces of the Kremlin, and if that attack, together with other wars which are now in progress, were to spread into a worldwide war, we might be fighting alongside Yugoslavia. But I can see no reason on earth why Stalin should provoke a war with Yugoslavia, with world conditions as they are today.

But that is not associated with the danger to us. That is a quarrel between Communists. If the war which we are now fighting, and in which our boys are dying in foreign lands, being entrapped by the Red Chinese troops at this hour, is a war inspired from Moscow, if this is the beginning of world war III, if this is the occasion when the blue chips are down again, Mr. President, the Kremlin would be more stupid than it has demonstrated at any time in the past if it were now to start a war with Tito. The natural and likely thing would be simply to bypass Tito and march on through Europe. Then what would we have? We would have Yugoslavia sitting there as a neutral. But I dare say that if the situation ever developed to the point where Tito thought the Kremlin was going to win, he would be found hastening to join the Soviet Union for the kill.

What Senator has any confidence that Tito would risk his life with us? I do not believe it. I should like to help the people over there who are in distress.

But I do not want to spend one dollar of American money to aid or bolster any Communist government.

A few minutes ago I came from my office in response to the quorum call. While there I picked up a newspaper from my own State. I believe it is the second largest in circulation in Arkansas. I found therein an editorial of Tuesday, December 5. The editorial is entitled "Tell our 'Friends' To Get in There, Too." This editorial, together with many letters which I am receiving from my constituents, convinces me that the American people know we are now in the position of holding the bag. We are not being treated properly in this conflict by those whom we have so generously befriended. I invite my colleagues to listen to this editorial. It is not very long. I shall read it:

TELL OUR "FRIENDS" TO GET IN THERE, TOO

The blue chips are down. This fighting in Korea is war, not a "police action." And American boys are doing most of the fighting and dying against an overwhelming horde of Red Chinese.

How much longer is this to go on, while our "friends" in the UN talk, and talk, and talk?

Washington can talk bluntly enough to the American people. It doesn't hesitate to tell them that they must sacrifice for their freedom, must accept hardships, bitter casualty lists, any cost our Red foes may exact.

That is proper and right. But why the tenderness toward the other UN nations, who have just as much at stake as we have? It's their war as much as it is ours. Are we to help support them and fight their battles, too?

Negotiating is all well enough. No chance for a peace settlement by diplomatic means should be passed up.

But words avail nothing with Red China and Russia. They respect only the iron speech of military strength. There will be no basis for negotiation if the Communist horde decimates our little Army in Korea and drives its fragments out.

Why haven't our "friends" got something more than a few token forces in that broken, hard-pressed front? They voted in the UN to stop the aggression in Korea. They've had 5 months of precious time.

If they all, including India, had responded, the story might be very different now. The Red Chinese might not have stormed into Korea. But our "friends" talked, and talked, and still talk.

Washington should talk now, in blunt words. It should tell our allies that either they come across with fighting men or we will look to our own interests. Then if we must fight China, with Russia back of her, call on Chiang Kai-shek's half-million troops. Arm the Japanese. Hunt out Nationalist guerrillas in China and equip them to harass the Reds.

We have resources if we will use them. It is folly for us to fight Russia's stooge-millions alone, while forty-odd other nations prattle and blather on the sidelines.

The Communists will respect no peace that might be patched up if they see that the UN nations have no stomach to resist them. Now, when the blue chips are down, is the time to find out which nations will stand with us to save themselves.

Mr. President, as I stated, letters from my constituents clearly indicate their distress, their alarm, their concern, and their inability to understand why some things have occurred and why others are now happening. They do not understand why more governments of the

United Nations are not fighting in this conflict, just as America is. I cannot answer that question, Mr. President.

I have received letters from wives, and from fathers and mothers, inquiring about their husbands and sons. They ask why they must fight under such conditions, and why we are not fighting the Chinese in China, with bombs to destroy their military installations and their arms and ammunition depots. They ask why we are doing nothing but holding our boys in the mountains in freezing weather, while hordes of the Reds pile in from across the border, bringing with them the arms and equipment which they had gathered and stored across the border in preparation for this invasion.

Mr. President, I cannot answer all those questions. I do not have all the answers. However, I say that the American people want to know more than they are being told today about why conditions are as they are.

The question arises about the use of the A-bomb. I do not know if and when and where the A-bomb should be used in this conflict. I am not a military expert. There are many factors which should be considered in that connection. I do not know how many A-bombs we have. I do not know whether we are prepared to start an A-bomb war and carry it through successfully. If I thought we were, before daylight tomorrow morning I would drop an A-bomb anywhere where it would do the most devastation to the enemies of our country and those who are killing our boys, if I knew that that was the wise thing to do under present conditions. I have no hesitancy or qualms about doing whatever is necessary in this conflict and whatever becomes imperative to save our country and prevent more American boys from dying.

Mr. President, there is only \$38,000,000 involved in this particular bill. I have heard it said that it is one of the best investments that we could possibly make with that amount of money.

Mr. President, that is simply a matter of opinion. Those who contend it is, may be correct. Subsequent events may prove them to be correct in their opinion. But, Mr. President, based on our past experiences, I do not see how the proposed investment is the best investment we can make at this time.

We are being asked to appropriate billions of dollars to rearm America. I do not know what one A-bomb costs, but I would rather invest some of it in one A-bomb, from the standpoint of strengthening the security of America, than to spend it to aid a Communist government, a government which subscribes to and practices a philosophy that the people who believe in freedom and religious liberty and the fundamentals of Americanism are their mortal enemy and must be destroyed. Until I have some assurance, until I can obtain some information upon which I might place some measure of reliance, I cannot, under those conditions, believe that this breach between Tito and his Communist government and the Kremlin and the Communist government of Moscow is more than a mere scratch on the surface

that may quickly heal. I do not think Tito and Stalin disagree upon a single fundamental. It is only a question of leadership—their philosophies are the same.

Mr. President, I may be wrong, but I shall take the chance of refusing, until I have further information, until I know something which convinces me to the contrary, to vote to spend American dollars, money which we have got to borrow, in bolstering a Communist government anywhere in the world.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask Senators who have the bill in charge if it is the intention that the Senate vote on the bill tonight, or that it go over until Monday?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is our hope that the bill may be acted upon this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not know whether it was the intention of the majority leader that the Senate vote on it tonight, or that it be carried over until Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is only one amendment to the bill, I may say, to which no one seems to object. That relates to certain religious conditions existing in Yugoslavia at the present time. After the Senator from Nevada has concluded his speech, and another Senator has spoken, we probably can have a vote on the bill. I should like to have the Senate vote on it today, so it may go to the other House as soon as possible, because the Appropriations Committee must act upon it. It is an emergency measure. I may say the Senator from Texas desires that it be passed, if possible, today.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1 from line 5, through line 8, it is proposed to strike out all of section 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The President is hereby authorized to expend not in excess of \$50,000,000 of the funds heretofore appropriated for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Administration Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), for the purpose of providing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia under the authority of this act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is designed primarily to conserve the appropriations this Government is called up to make in this time of emergency. It will not restrict the authority of the President to aid Yugoslavia in accordance with the terms of the bill as it is now before the Senate. It merely provides that the funds for this emergency relief shall be utilized from funds already appropriated for the Economic Cooperation Administration.

In view of our many obligations it is time we began to husband our resources

before we find ourselves on the brink of ruin economically.

My subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee has followed closely the funds expended by the Economic Cooperation Administration. Through October 31 the ECA procurement authorizations were running at an annual rate of approximately \$1,300,000,000. To this must be added an authorization of \$350,000,000 for the European payments union, making a total of approximately \$1,650,000,000 out of the ECA appropriations. However, there is available for obligation approximately \$2,650,000,000 during the current year. At the present rate of expenditure there is possible a carry-over by ECA of from \$500,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000. To authorize \$50,000,000 of this sum for the purposes of providing emergency relief to Yugoslavia will not retard or interfere with the ECA program. The gold and dollar reserves of the participating countries have increased almost \$2,000,000,000 since September 1949. This increase has been greatest during the past 4 months when ECA aid to these countries has been at an all-time low. In fact, the greatest improvement in the gold and dollar situation of the participating countries has occurred while ECA procurement authorizations were by far the lowest in the history of the Marshall plan. The ECA's recovery guide for October 1950 points out especially the improved position of the participating countries during the July-September quarter of this year. I quote the following from this guide:

Economic developments affecting the participating countries of Western Europe in the summer of 1950 following the outbreak of the Korean crisis, represented a continuation and intensification of trends already apparent during the earlier months of the year. Western Europe's exports continued to increase, its balance of trade to improve, its dollar gap to narrow, and its hard currency reserves to increase. . . . (Devaluation and continued prosperity in the Western World have combined) to bring about a striking improvement in Western Europe's economic position, especially in its balance of payments position. In the year that has elapsed since September 1949, Western Europe's exports to nonparticipating countries have expanded sharply, its imports have held constant. Intra-ERP trade has shown an extraordinary expansion. Production has continued to grow at a rapid rate, thus feeding both higher exports and domestic consumption, and investment. Output in July 1950 was 13 percent above that of July 1949. The hard currency holdings (gold and dollars) of the participating countries have increased almost \$2,000,000,000 since September 1949.

The gold and dollar reserves of the participating countries showed a further sharp increase during the third quarter of 1950.

Let me say at this point, Mr. President, that today our dollars are being banked in England, while we are borrowing the dollars from the people of the United States. The dollars our Government is borrowing from our citizens are going into the banks in England and are being saved there.

I can assure the Senate that if my amendment is adopted, the effectiveness of the ECA will not be interfered with, and we shall be saving \$38,000,000. I

realize that is not very much, as money goes these days; but it is something, and it might begin a trend in the right direction.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was interrupted at the moment when the Senator was speaking; but I think he gave the figures as to the British increase in gold reserves.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood the Senator to say that that increase approximates the amount we are giving to Britain. Did the Senator say that?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Approximately \$1,000,000,000, I believe?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator's attention also been called to what I think is correct, namely, that during the quarter from July to October the reserves, in dollars, of the European countries participating in the ECA plan were accumulating at the annual rate of approximately \$2,500,000,000, which is approximately the amount we are providing under ECA?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have referred to that, and I am glad to have the Senator emphasize it, because it is an important point.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; and it is an indication of how prudently the program is being managed, after we have borrowed the money.

Is it not also true that Britain has had a balanced budget during this period?

Mr. McCARRAN. Britain has had practically a balanced budget; yes.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that his proposal is to transfer \$50,000,000 from the ECA appropriations?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; up to \$50,000,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This amendment was not presented to the committee, and I am not quite sure of its full significance. Would the amendment, if adopted, mean that in order to take advantage of these funds, Yugoslavia would have to abide by all the obligations which other ECA countries now have to assume?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not necessarily. If I had my own way, I would say they should, but not necessarily under this amendment. In other words, the amendment will provide an opportunity for the President to utilize up to \$50,000,000 of the ECA funds, to be devoted to the very purpose for which this bill is before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it be fair to say that the only effect of the Senator's amendment, if adopted, will be that instead of appropriating fresh money out of the Treasury, we shall be transferring, free from any other obligation, this amount of money for the President to use?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; out of the ECA funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Out of the ECA funds; yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

That is why, Mr. President, I am discussing the situation, for it is my purpose to try to show the Senate that the conditions in Europe at the present time justify the conclusion, without fear of successful contradiction, that there will be anywhere from a \$500,000,000 to a \$1,000,000,000 ECA carry-over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the next question I wished to ask specifically.

Mr. McCARRAN. I covered that in the earlier part of my remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assume that there is no real disagreement between the Senator from Nevada and the ECA officials themselves that there will be a very substantial surplus which ECA will not need.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, a surplus of at least more than \$50,000,000. That is all we need to be interested in, insofar as the Senator's amendment goes.

Mr. McCARRAN. In my own judgment, it will exceed \$500,000,000, and will run toward \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, that leads me to observe that that indicates that the Marshall plan has at least been successful in achieving the effect we intended.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the report coming from the ECA's Recovery Guide—from which I have read only an excerpt—shows how successful the program has been up to date. It shows the gold dollar reserves at the present time—reserves which are practically up to standard. It shows, I repeat, that today Britain is banking American dollars, whereas we are borrowing dollars from our American citizens.

I point that out simply to emphasize the fact that the step proposed to be taken under the amendment can be taken without impairing at all the efficacy of the program under the Marshall plan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make sure—because I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment at all—that the basic principle of the Marshall plan is not involved at all.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator explain why the amendment provides for \$50,000,000, when the pending bill calls for only \$38,000,000?

Mr. McCARRAN. They have already used \$12,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that amount taken out of ECA funds?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; out of the ECA funds.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that authorized by the ECA Act?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot find any authorization for it, Mr. President. If I were to give the Senator from Vermont a blunt answer, I would say it is not authorized, but I would say that

with reservations. I say frankly that on the basis of the language used in the ECA Act, I have been unable to justify the use of that money.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, the Senator's amendment contemplates legalizing the expenditure of \$12,000,000, in addition to the authorization proposed by the pending measure; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that answers my question.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to know why the Senator by his amendment seeks to be more generous in the use of funds than the State Department does, although the record of the State Department, as I have observed, is one of great generosity in these matters. In short, I refer to the difference between the \$38,000,000 authorization carried in the pending bill and the \$50,000,000 authorization carried in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. The \$12,000,000 which already has been utilized will be covered into the \$50,000,000 authorization, and that will leave an authorization of \$38,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment which would require that to be done? It would appear to me that when we consider the tenuous authority, if any, that the State Department had for its expenditures in the first place, if we expect it to replace what it already has spent, but which seemingly it had no authority to spend, we had better expressly provide that that be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am in general agreement with the Senator from Oregon, in that I have grave doubt as to the authority under the ECA Act for the use of the \$12,000,000. However, be that as it may, that money has already been used. Now they want \$38,000,000 in order to be able to go on with the program for the relief of Yugoslavia.

If we adopt this amendment, thus providing that they may utilize up to \$50,000,000 of ECA funds, that will cover the \$12,000,000 which they may have utilized without authority, and will give them authority to utilize \$38,000,000 in addition.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator consider modifying his amendment so as to provide that the \$12,000,000 shall be in lieu of the funds already spent?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would not object to modifying the amendment in that way.

Mr. CORDON. It seems to me that the amendment should be very specific.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would not object to modifying the amendment in that way, except for the fact that I do not like to give positive agreement to something which I do not think was done legally.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator consider such a modification over the week end?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I certainly would.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has stated that Great Britain has been taking the borrowed dollars which we have sent to her and has been putting them in banks in England. Will the Senator go into detail in that connection, or will he address a question to the sponsor of the bill, so that we may find what justification he has for such a procedure? After all, that point is a vital one.

Mr. McCARRAN. Today the funds we are affording Great Britain in the way of American dollars are not being utilized for the purposes contemplated by the Marshall plan. Britain does not need the money. Great Britain's economy is up to par, and Britain does not need that money. So what are the British doing with our dollars? They are putting them in the bank; that is what they are doing with them.

Mr. STENNIS. Why does the ECA Administrator continue to send those dollars, if they are not needed? Can the Senator from Nevada answer that question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume that the Senator from Nevada is familiar with the ECA's methods of doing business. If the ECA had the right to expend the \$12,000,000 which has been spent for relief of Yugoslavia, and if there is sufficient ECA money on hand, as the Senator from Nevada seems to think there is, what is the reason for this bill at all—if the ECA has authority to spend the additional amount of money?

Mr. McCARRAN. This bill comes to us because Yugoslavia is not an ECA participating country, and never has been.

Mr. AIKEN. But if the ECA had authority to spend the \$12,000,000, it has authority to spend \$50,000,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator may argue that way if he wishes to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not wish to do so. I am seeking information.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have information accompanied by a reasonable degree of legality.

Mr. AIKEN. But if it is reasonable for the ECA to spend \$12,000,000 for this purpose, it is reasonable for them to spend \$50,000,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wish to do anything to impair the Marshall plan.

Mr. AIKEN. No one does.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I thought I was even on the edge of impairing the Marshall plan, I would not go forward with this amendment. However, I know it is admitted that the ECA has a carry-over. The ECA had a heavy carry-over last year, and this year the ECA will have a larger carry-over because the economies of the participating European countries have improved during that period of time.

Mr. President, in this critical period it behooves us to take every possible step to conserve our assets, inasmuch as we do not know the extent to which we may be called upon to furnish dollars in the near future. Faced, as we are, with unknown obligations, we must use our funds to achieve the greatest returns possible. It does not make sense to make or authorize new appropriations—which is what the pending bill in its present form provides—while we have already appropriated vast sums that could be used.

If more funds are needed before June 30, I am sure the Congress will be in a position to provide them.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment. I submit it without any fear that, if adopted, it will impair the Marshall plan. I submit the amendment because I think the time has come when we should look to the proper use of American dollars, and when we should stop making appropriations if there will be heavy carry-overs from appropriations already made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I first desire to express my regret that I was unable to be present at the committee hearings on this bill, and to become acquainted with some of the grounds upon which it is based. I also voice my regret that there is no evidence available to support the conclusions of the committee. It is not pleasant to appear here in the role of a devil's advocate, but this subject is of great importance.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on all amendments to the pending measure on Monday at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is agreeable.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that excludes a vote on the bill itself. Am I correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. It does not include a vote on the bill itself. It is a proposal that the Senate vote on all amendments at 4 o'clock, and when that hour arrives and we vote on the amendments, we may then insist upon a vote on the bill; but that is not contained in the request as submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may make an inquiry of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], Was it the intention to vote on each amendment at the hour of 4 o'clock, without any further debate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And is that what was agreed to?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, it would be impossible to vote at 4 o'clock if there were to be any debate. The request I made was that at 4 o'clock Monday the Senate vote on all amendments.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, could there be some agreement as to a discussion, perhaps, for the 2 hours preceding 4 o'clock, so there would be opportunity for Senators to speak who might want to do so at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would point out that there is already an agreement to vote at 1 o'clock on certain amendments to the railroad labor bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am aware of that, but that will be out of the way by 4 o'clock.

Mr. BREWSTER. Could we have an agreement that between 2 and 4 o'clock there would be 10 minutes allocated equally to each side, on the various amendments?

Mr. CONNALLY. Tomorrow?

Mr. BREWSTER. On Monday, between 2 and 4.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know how the railroad bill would affect that situation.

Mr. WHERRY. We have an agreement on this bill, have we not?

Mr. CONNALLY. We have an agreement to vote at 4 o'clock on all amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. It is already agreed upon; therefore, there is nothing to be done now.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, was there a quorum call, in accordance with the rule, before the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into?

Mr. CONNALLY. A quorum call is not required on an agreement affecting amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The agreement does not include the final passage of the bill.

Mr. KEM. Earlier in the afternoon when a similar request was made in connection with unanimous consent regarding an amendment to the railway labor bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made the point that no quorum call had been had.

Mr. LUCAS. He merely said he was going to object, unless a quorum call was ordered.

Mr. KEM. And he did object. I feel quite sure that, if the Senator from Oregon had been on the floor when this request was made, he would have objected again.

Mr. CONNALLY. But he was not on the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the agreement has already been entered into, I feel that, if the Senator from Texas will agree, we might vote on the first amendment. I do not care about any more debate on the first amendment. Obviously, we cannot vote on all the amendments at one time. I wonder whether it would be agreeable to have an understanding that, after the vote is taken on the first amendment, say 10 minutes on a side on each amendment be allotted until we vote on all of them. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think it would be better if, between 2 and 4 o'clock, the time could be divided between the two sides for the discussion of both the amendments and, as far as I am concerned, the bill, in order that

we might be sure that both points of view on the matter may be adequately presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that that, of course, would be contingent upon the ability of the Senate to finish with the railroad labor bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say there is only one amendment, aside from the one offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], on which we are all agreed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true, I think.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no danger.

Mr. WHERRY. May we enter into a further unanimous-consent agreement that, after the railroad labor bill has been disposed of finally, the time between then and 4 o'clock shall be divided equally between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Maine—if the Senator from Maine cares to assume that responsibility—or between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I suppose the Senator from Nevada should take it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. We could then vote on that amendment, and then upon all remaining amendments to the bill, and we might agree that, if any additional amendments were offered, 10 minutes to a side be allotted on each amendment, and then proceed to vote on the amendments. Is that agreeable? Of course, there should be the usual stipulation that all amendments must be germane.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. If that is agreeable to everyone, I ask that the unanimous consent heretofore entered into be modified accordingly.

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

The entire unanimous-consent agreement as reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, December 11, 1950, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, under the limitation of debate hereinafter provided, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia: *Provided*, That after the said hour of 4 p. m., debate upon any amendment or motion shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. CONNALLY; (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received; and (3) that no vote on any amendment or motion proposed to the said bill shall be had prior to said hour of 4 o'clock.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the disposition of the so-called railway labor bill and the said hour of 4 o'clock on said day of Monday, December 11, shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the passage of said bill and controlled, respectively, by Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. McCARRAN.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry the Senator from Nevada is not present at the

moment. While he is out of the Senate Chamber, I accept the amendment offered by him.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure we are profoundly grateful for that. That is a great step forward.

Mr. CONNALLY. How grateful is the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be very gentle in my comments.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator desire to move the adoption of the amendment? It must be passed upon.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a little premature for that. I think we had better wait until Monday to finally pass upon this matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I anticipated the Senator from Maine would not agree, if I were willing to accept it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am hoping I shall persuade the Senator from Texas to agree with me in this instance if he will listen to my suggestions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall listen.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas is going to agree to this amendment, we can probably get this bill out of the way tonight, because there are no objections to the other amendments.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there are other considerations besides the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. It is not the entire subject matter of this discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is nothing else pending.

Mr. LUCAS. There is a bill pending.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to speak to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am quite sure the Senator from Texas is not going to insist that the liberty of discussion be curtailed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I desire to state my understanding of the parliamentary situation relative to the pending bill giving aid to Yugoslavia. It is this: That when the so-called railway labor bill, on which we have entered into a unanimous-consent agreement, is out of the way and finished, the time between then and 4 o'clock Monday, December 11, will be divided between the proponents and opponents of the bill for Yugoslavia, and any amendments thereto; that at 4 o'clock, whatever amendments are then offered to the bill shall be voted upon; and, on any amendments which are germane, and which may be offered hereafter, debate shall be limited to 10 minutes on a side, until final passage of the bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself first to the Senator from Arkansas, who challenged some questions that I raised regarding the extent of the drought in Yugoslavia. I may say that I discussed that question rather fully with Mr. Haggerty, who is

the authority the Senator cited, Mr. Haggerty having been the agricultural attaché in Yugoslavia at the time we visited there in September of this year. I think that in the very report which has been filed by the committee it is quite evident that the extent of the drought is definitely determined, so far as Mr. Haggerty was familiar with it. The State Department, when it issued the release on this matter, said there had been a total crop failure, and I took occasion to comment that that was totally in error.

In the report of the committee, it appears that the corn crop of Yugoslavia for the current year is 59 percent of normal for 1947-49; the wheat crop is 88 percent of normal. Those are the two major crops. The percentages in 1950 of 1947-49 average of other commodities produced in Yugoslavia, as listed in the committee report, are as follows:

	Percent
Rye.....	83
Barley.....	87
Oats.....	79
Rice.....	100
Vegetables and melons.....	57
Potatoes.....	67
Edible fats.....	88
Sugar.....	108
Beans.....	72
Peas.....	57

I may say that corn and wheat are the major crops, as we were told by Mr. Haggerty. I desire to call attention now to the next sentence of the committee report:

These figures do not tell the whole story. Yugoslavia normally has food enough to export and thereby acquire foreign exchange with which to buy needed imports.

Certainly people are not starving when they have the food which is in any such amounts as those indicated; certainly at least not until the last half of the year. I noticed that the Senator from Arkansas referred to this crop year. This crop year runs until the harvest of next August and September, and the point which I wish to make is that there are very considerable reserves of food in Yugoslavia at the present time, unless they are exporting it.

I visited some of the farms with Mr. Haggerty. He pointed out the conditions. I saw some corn, which was equal to the finest corn ever raised in Iowa, which was being fed to the hogs on a cooperative farm which we visited in September of this year—finer corn than I have ever seen raised in most of the States in this country. There were very considerable supplies, as is indicated by the report of the committee.

I had anticipated that this would be a subject for the early consideration of the next Congress when it convened in January, and that there would be ample time then for the Congress elected last November to consider with all reasonable diligence the questions involved. Certainly I would desire that there be no undue delay. However, I regret that there has been the precipitate action which is indicated by what the State Department and the administration have done today.

Mr. President, there are aspects of the matter which lead me to ponder the

wisdom of the course suggested. The tremendous haste to get aid to Yugoslavia, in contrast with the extreme reluctance to get Congress-directed aid to Spain has aroused in me questions as to why there should be this almost unseemly haste in the face of the very figures which the committee itself includes in its report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not intend to leave the impression that there was no corn and no wheat and no rye at all. However, I think 59 percent is what certainly we would call a crop failure in this country.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a decrease of 41 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I referred to 59 percent of what their normal crop is.

Mr. BREWSTER. They do not say it is normal. They say the average of 2 or 3 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assume that would be normal. I asked Mr. Haggerty how the present drought compared with any other drought which Yugoslavia had experienced, and he said that the present drought was much the worse drought in the country's history. The last drought which was at all comparable to the present one occurred in 1927.

I agree that as of today the people in Yugoslavia are not starving, and that there are some provisions available. However, the Senator from Maine knows as well as I do how slowly Government machinery moves. After an authorization is obtained, the appropriations must be voted. After that the actual getting of the supplies into the pipelines takes additional time. If we were to pass the bill now, it is likely that it would be as late as February or March before much of this material would begin to move to Yugoslavia. That would be true certainly unless we resorted to some strenuous or rigid measures such as the transfer of wheat from Italy. Why that was done, except that there was an emergency, I do not know. I assume the picture is spotty, and that there are places where the situation is really bad today, and that there are other places where it is not so bad.

I should like to make one further comment. Reference was made to aid to Spain. In my view—and I think it is the view of the committee—the reason for passing the pending bill is not altogether humanitarian and not altogether due to our concern for people who need something to eat. There is no question that there are other considerations which are influenced by the state of the world today. The fact has already been commented upon. Certainly the fact is having an effect—and I would say a political effect—upon the attitude of the people of Yugoslavia.

Let us put ourselves in the position where 6 months from today the people of Yugoslavia can see that if they do not get aid they will be starving. Any prudent person must make some decision as to what will happen. The decision must be made whether they will get aid. If they do not know whether they will get some aid 2 or 3 months from now, during the interval I think they would have to do something about it. They would have to do one of two things.

They would have to give up their independence and say to Moscow, "You have licked us. Therefore we are coming back to you on our knees. We may starve if we don't." They would have to do that or they would have to overthrow the present government.

Mr. BREWSTER. That might not be an unmitigated evil.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would be a great loss to the west if Yugoslavia, with 30 army divisions, were to beg Moscow's pardon and then become an integral part of Soviet Russia.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not what the Senator from Maine suggests. If the Senator from Arkansas assumes that any change in government in Yugoslavia would necessarily be to the left, it must be on the basis of assumptions which are not warranted by any evidence presented thus far.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the evidence is pretty clear.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to finish my statement, please. As a matter of fact, the government which was supplanted by Tito's government was to the right, and not to the left. The Communists are presumably a very small proportion of the population of the country. However, the Tito group is dominant and has control. I believe the Senator is familiar with the situation that in many countries Communists have taken control, although they represent only 5 or 10 percent of the population. However, it does not necessarily follow that any change in government would be to a government which looks in the direction of Moscow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that part of the world it is clear to me that it would be toward Moscow. The same situation exists in Czechoslovakia. I agree that the great popular support is not for communism. However, the fact is that Yugoslavia's neighbors—Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary, and Poland—are under the complete domination of Moscow. It is not because the people of those countries love Moscow. It is because there is no force in those countries sufficiently strong to overthrow the Communists. The only reason that Yugoslavia can get away with its defiance of Russia and can maintain its independence is because it has an outlet to the west. It has an outlet to the sea, and consequently there is always the possibility of aid from us. Yugoslavia has an approach by sea. We can get to Yugoslavia. They can develop a relationship with the west. We cannot do anything about it so far as Bulgaria or Rumania or any of the other countries are concerned, and will not be likely to be in a position to do anything about it in the near future simply because of that reason. If we do not help the people of Yugoslavia to maintain their independence they have no place to turn.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is no suggestion by the Senator from Maine that we would wish to destroy the independence of Yugoslavia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is the main reason why the bill should be passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas further whether or not Mr. Haggerty stated to the committee the system under which the Yugoslav Government accumulates its food and why there is difficulty with respect to it in some sections of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He did. We went into that question to some extent. Mr. Haggerty struck me as being a well-informed man as to the effect of collectivization, and that sort of thing. Collectivization, he told us, and I agreed, has also tended to decrease the production of Yugoslavia, and so on. That is in addition to the drought. However, I do not see how we can do anything about it at the present time.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not the point to which I was addressing myself, although it is very interesting and somewhat anachronistic that Yugoslavia, which is a disciple of communism and collectivization, should seek aid from the free-enterprise system. The point I wish to make is that the Tito regime had made an assessment of a certain percentage of the crop. Last year that did not work out. Accordingly, they made an assessment on each farmer for so much corn and wheat, which the farmer, according to his normal production, must deliver. The Government did not set up a percentage, but set up the assessment in so many bushels. When the shortage came, the corn crop being only 59 percent of normal, and wheat about 88 percent, it meant that if the peasant did not deliver the assessment he would have nothing left with which to feed his family. The result was that the peasant headed out into the woods. He was not going to see his children starve. The peasant is assessed a certain quota, and if he cannot meet it, he is put in the work gangs that we saw being marched through the streets of Belgrade under the guns of the militia.

There would be no reason for the peasants of Yugoslavia to starve if they were permitted to have the food which they themselves have raised. When the government seizes the food, either for the army or for export, and allows its peasants to starve, it is not demonstrating much concern for its citizens or for its institutions. There is no question that the peasants would be able to get along all right if they could have some food for their families. That is what they are denied under the current policies of the government. My information in that respect came from Mr. Haggerty in person in Belgrade.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not disputing that aspect. Certainly the Senator from Maine cannot put me in the position of defending the domestic policies of Yugoslavia. That is not my purpose at all. The pending bill has nothing whatever to do with that situation. If we were thinking of Yugoslavia alone, with no relation to the present difficulties in which we find ourselves with regard to Russia, it would be an entirely different matter. I do not approve of those practices. I think they are wrong; they are misguided; they defeat their own purposes. I will go along with the Senator in that

respect. I do not think, however, that it has anything to do with the passage of the bill insofar as our interests at this particular time are concerned. That is all I wish to say. I completely dissociate the wisdom of their domestic policies from what is proposed to be done by the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. To me it is unfortunate that the humanitarian and expedient are so obviously intermingled, and I believe the Senator from Arkansas will agree with me. There are approximately a billion people in the world who are in dire distress. At Dublin, in September, at the Interparliamentary Union meeting, the representatives of India, Burma, and Ceylon denounced America as imperial colonialists because we were pursuing exactly the same policies which Britain, France, and the Netherlands are pursuing. They denounced us in unmistakable terms, and not one voice was raised in our defense, except as we could raise our own feeble voice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I can say to the Senator from Maine in that respect is that we are confronted with a very serious situation which involves our very survival. I am quite willing to ignore the denunciations of India, if that is the way they feel about a situation such as this. I think we in the western countries are in an extremely serious situation, and it is high time that we tried to do some very practical things with respect to the challenge of Russia, regardless of whether it pleases the idealism of India, or any other country. I am not familiar with the denunciations to which the Senator has referred, but I could be critical of India, if it becomes necessary to discuss the subject. However, I do not think it would serve any purpose to do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. What puzzles me is that the Senator should present this subject first as a humanitarian measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not do any such thing.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Connecticut was the one who expressed that though when he said, "We are seeking to assist people in distress."

That was earlier advocated. The Senator from Arkansas is very frank in saying that this is a matter of expediency, and that we need to keep this situation under some kind of control.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will go further and say that that was the predominating motive for ECA, and I said so on this floor. It was not because I was interested primarily in raising the standard of living of the British or French. I can find people in my own State who need help so far as their standard of living is concerned. If the Senator wishes to call it expediency, that is all right. I think it is simply a sensible effort to preserve the integrity of western civilization.

Mr. BREWSTER. Self-interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Exactly. It is an effort to survive. It was self-interest in an effort to preserve what we sometimes call western civilization. That is the principal motive for the entire program of ECA.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under ECA and under the North Atlantic Pact, in re-

turn for the assistance we have been rendering we have asked very considerable obligations. We have pledged more assistance than we have received thus far, even under the United Nations.

Under the circumstances it is to me a matter of regret that it did not seem appropriate to request some further commitments than are indicated or envisioned here. We hear about the 32 divisions of Tito, but there is no suggestion that they will ever be utilized unless his own country shall be invaded. I believe that the Senator from Arkansas or one of the other previous speakers emphasized that the Russians would undoubtedly move, if they decided to move, through Germany or Austria, or in other directions. In that event there is nothing whatever to indicate that Tito will not continue to teeter on the fence, exactly where he has been. Even since his break with Stalin, he has voted half the time with Russia in the United Nations. That is a situation which I find it very difficult to understand when he comes to us hat in hand. He assured us in Belgrade in September that he was still a practicing Communist. He made no bones about it. He did not deny it. He said, "I believe in communism." The very words which he used were:

I look upon myself as the leader of the progressive peoples behind the iron curtain.

In other words, he was to take the place of Stalin as the leader of the Communists in the event, when, as, and if, he should liquidate Mr. Stalin, if Mr. Tito were not liquidated first. I think the American people are entitled to know something of the story of what goes on over there, and whether or not the course of action which is proposed is wise.

I have a very considerable respect for Mr. Reams, counselor of our Embassy, who in my judgment was the best informed man there. If I were to attach final weight to any opinion, it would be to his. That is what impressed me more than any other aspect of this matter. But unfortunately Mr. Reams is not going to be there. He has now left the embassy. He is here. He had been there for a long time. I have great respect for George Allen, our Ambassador, but he has only recently arrived. He is undoubtedly trying to do the best he can, but he faces an exceedingly difficult and delicate situation.

I cannot comprehend how the amendment dealing with religious, economic, and political liberty means anything at all. It simply says that we do not approve certain practices. In other connections, when we have had some other problems, our State Department has been vehement against certain countries. There was denunciation of Spain, where the abuses of religions are utterly insignificant compared with what is going on in Yugoslavia at the present time. Archbishop Stepinac and 400 priests are in jail. Three hundred and eighty have been murdered. There has been no such record of religious persecution in Spain, yet our State Department would never consider assistance to Spain because, forsooth, there had been alleged religious persecution, the circumstances of which

were absolutely not supported by our investigations on the ground.

Some 10,000 Greek children were kidnapped by the Yugoslavs and their associates under Moscow domination. They have returned 50 or 60 of them. We took the matter up with Mr. Tito, and he absolutely refused to discuss it. He said, "That is a matter that we cannot go into at this time." He now talks about the 50 or 60 whom he returned.

We have heard a great deal about civil rights, and habeas corpus. It was announced a little while ago that measures were being formulated in Yugoslavia by which they proposed to lift some of the restrictions of a police state upon their people. Then it was added, "These proposals will be presented to the Yugoslav Assembly next spring when it meets." Next spring is a long way off.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to bring up a privileged matter, a conference report—

Mr. BREWSTER. Just a moment. I did not yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is a privileged matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. Not while I am speaking.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood—

Mr. BREWSTER. I assumed that the Senator wanted to ask me a question. I did not assume that he was going to take me off the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not suggest such a thing.

I ask unanimous consent, if it does not require any great amount of time, to present the report—

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to finish my remarks. I shall not unduly detain the Senate. I have been waiting all afternoon.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not finish the request I was about to make.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not propose to yield for that purpose. I am sorry, but I have been waiting all afternoon. I have some other obligations as well. I wish to dispose of this matter as quickly as I can.

Mr. President, I question seriously the effectiveness or the wisdom of this proposed grant to Yugoslavia.

What is the purpose of it? It is to bolster the authority of a Communist dictator who appears to have fallen out with Moscow and who now, because of a crop failure, finds himself in deadly peril between Stalin on the one hand and his rebellious and enslaved people on the other.

The State Department contends that the break with Moscow has magically turned the Yugoslav Government into a bulwark against Communism and that the Yugoslav Communist army is of vital importance in holding up the Russian advance.

This line of argument is difficult to accept.

The Yugoslav people already have had one bitter lesson in the operation of American policies. Their Communist dictator, Josip Broz, popularly known as Tito, got his place originally through the insistence of Stalin and an American camarilla of fellow travelers, headed by Louis Adamic, who had access to the

White House. The United States Government, in the process of being an echo to Moscow in Tito's support, did nothing to prevent the treacherous betrayal and execution of Mihailovich, the great Yugoslav hero of the war. Mihailovich, the enemy of the Nazis, whose determined campaign held up the German advance in the Balkans many weeks, was handed over in 1946 to Tito's Communist gang and then judicially murdered.

The American people also have had a bitter illustration of Tito's character. In August 1946 a United States plane, flying its regular run from Vienna to the Udine, was beaten out of its course by a storm and passed over Yugoslav territory. Without a warning of any kind, Tito's gunners shot the plane down and the flyers were killed. Who but Dean Acheson said that this wanton attack was "an outrageous performance" and that "in practically every other part of the world the C-47 would have received help in getting its bearings. Instead it was shot down without warning." Now this same Dean Acheson wants \$38,000,000 to help prevent Tito's police-ridden subjects from rising up and throwing him out. Is this what we call aiding the freedom loving west?

Why should we believe that the Yugoslav army is any protection to us against Moscow? Once the break with Moscow occurred Tito had to conduct a bloody purge of his army. Today he cannot tell who is for and who is against him. Of course, many of his officers are secretly as close to Moscow and the Cominform as they have ever been. When I was in Yugoslavia three of his leaders deserted him and went over, indicating the very difficult time he himself now has.

Do not forget that the ruling clique in Belgrade, whether they have outwardly broken with Moscow or not, are still Communists and that Tito's government is still a Communist government. During the past 5 years our Government has embarked on the strange practice of finding some Communists good Communists and others bad Communists. In China that theory does not seem to have worked out so satisfactorily. There were those who assured us that General Mao and his associates were the good kind of Tito Communists. They are now murdering American boys in the hills of North Korea. I hope we shall not find another experience of serious misjudgment in the case with which we are now concerned. It seems to me that all Communists are alike, and that all are very questionable allies.

I might say at this point that our State Department's passion for Tito and his government has had ghastly results elsewhere. After Tito's break with Moscow some of Mr. Acheson's master minds evolved the theory of Titoism. Titoism is a word used to describe a left wing government that can not get on with Moscow. The State Department loved this theory of Titoism so much that they applied it to China. They said that the Chinese Communists were just agrarian reformers, that they would not go along with Moscow at all and that the Chinese Communist regime was already showing signs of Titoism. Today, as I speak,

those Chinese Communists are butchering Americans in cold blood in the snow-bound passes of North Korea. If that is what Titoism means in China, why should we expect it to be something different in Yugoslavia?

I have said that Yugoslavia is a Communist country and that, despite the purge, Tito cannot tell who is for and who is against him, who are secretly for Moscow and who are not. A year ago one of the members of the central committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia declared that 85 percent of the Communists are against Tito and for the Cominform. How many Communists there are is quite another question.

The common soldiers of the Yugoslav Army are young peasants who have not the slightest sympathy with Tito. Why should they? They have seen with their own eyes the forcible collectivization of thousands of Yugoslav farms. I myself visited one of them. Half a million peasants have been condemned to forced labor because they did not give enough corn to the Communist government. Tito's brutal exactions upon the peasant farmers have been carried out with just as much ruthlessness as Stalin's famous and bloody liquidation of the kulaks.

What is the basis for the argument that the Yugoslav Army can offer effective resistance to the Russians? The Yugoslav Army has an air force of 800 antique planes. What good will they be?

Along the Adriatic coast they have an old-time toy navy consisting of one frigate, three destroyers, eight torpedo boats, and seven lame and halt submarines. What good will they be?

In the event of open war with Russia, the bulk of the officers will go over to Stalin, the common soldiery will melt away to their homes or attempt to get across the frontier, and the remnant, the little Tito gang, will try to find a refuge in the Bosnian Mountains. Just exactly how is all that going to help the freedom-loving nations of the west?

There is no question about the fighting qualities of the Yugoslav soldier. His valor was shown in both the World Wars. But today he has no confidence in his government and no hope for the future. To be effective, the Yugoslav Army would have to be reorganized and equipped with modern weapons and given leaders whom it could trust. Such a reform is utterly beyond the power of the Tito regime.

Tito is literally caught in the middle of a terrible squeeze. In his prison camps are perhaps 10,000 suspected sympathizers of Moscow and double that number of Yugoslav Nationalists, who, of course, are not Communists at all, but are intense patriots and bitter enemies of the regime. These 20,000 are the remnants of the native patriots who openly opposed Tito. It is estimated that since November 1, 1944, when Tito entered Belgrade, no fewer than 60,000 of these Nationalists have been liquidated. In May 1945 the British Government, still pursuing, with the United States, a policy of Moscow appeasement at any price, handed over 14,000 Slovenes to the Yugoslav Communists. All were

killed out of hand. What possible reason have we to believe that there is any dependable strength in a government maintained with such blood-thirsty tyranny? Yet the administration asks that we give Tito outright \$38,000,000 worth of foodstuffs.

Yugoslavia has always been a region driven by faction and the longing of native patriots for many years has been for reforms that would help in blotting out the factionalism. The policy of Tito's government has been to inflame these factions wherever possible.

One age-old source of trouble in Yugoslavia has been religious differences. Before Tito, nearly 49 percent of the Yugoslav population were members of the orthodox eastern church, nearly 35 percent were Roman Catholics, and about 11 percent were Moslems. Far from attempting to encourage toleration, the tactics of Tito with the churches has been infamous. More than 380 Roman Catholic priests are dead at the hands of Tito's men and some 400 are in prison today. The most famous of all is Archbishop Stepinac. In October 1946 he was seized and brought to trial, charged with crimes against the state. His defense was that he had raised his voice against massacres and conversions by force, arguing that such things were against canon law. No matter. He was condemned to the loss of his civil rights and sentenced to 16 years in prison.

Recently, when we were in Yugoslavia, we discussed this matter with Marshal Tito. He indicated that he was considering the matter at the time; that he had had discussions with high church dignitaries and hoped the matter would be adjusted. The principal solution was that he would permit Archbishop Stepinac to be freed from jail if he would get out of the country, which involved, by implication, either a conclusion that Archbishop Stepinac was guilty of the crime with which he had been charged or that the Government of Yugoslavia, in accordance with Communist doctrine, should arrogate to itself the right to dominate the activities of the church. If Stepinac were guilty, then by leaving the country he admitted his guilt. On the other hand, if he were not guilty he must admit that Tito was to dominate the activities of the church within that land.

It seems to me that the amendment which is proposed, by which we partially look down our noses, and says we do not approve the religious, political, and economic dictatorship of Tito, is a very poor compensation for the conditions which undoubtedly prevail, not because we are engaged in any crusade to bring freedom and liberty to any country in the world, but because we have very little reason to rely upon the operations of a dictator who conducts the affairs of his own country in so incredible a manner.

The administration maintains that the exports of Yugoslavia to the west are of a critical character, that they are absolutely essential. What exports? The exports of the country have dwindled until they are only a fraction of what they once were. This is not alone due to devastations of the war? It is also due to the crazy, wholesale effort to communize

all business and industry. I note that even the House report on this Yugoslav proposal states that the rates for plan fulfillment of the Yugoslav 5-year plan "must have been"—and I am quoting—"the results of statistical ledgerdom."

Mr. President, I am convinced that the pending proposal is of very questionable expedience, if not worse, and will represent no true aid whatsoever to the enslaved Yugoslav people. Moreover, here again we have American foreign policy at work with the same mistakes which have brought us to the sorry mess we see today. We are asked by the State Department to make this grant without gaining any assurances or considerations for the interests of the United States or of the free world. We can be certain that nothing will be done by Tito to rectify the confiscation of American economic interests in Yugoslavia. Even France in her recent aid to Yugoslavia was not so foolish. She demanded adjustments on the claims of her citizens.

The whole adventure bears the same precarious and doubtful character as does so many of our so-called calculated risks which turned out to be all risks and no calculation.

Mr. President, I hope that very careful consideration may be given to the bill before we enter into the arrangement. I hope the State Department and the administration will find it expedient—since this is a measure of expediency and not humanitarianism—to secure much more definite assurances from the present government of Yugoslavia before we commit so much of the money and the resources of this Government to help a country which, in the event of any crisis that may occur, we would find of very doubtful aid.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—CHANGE OF CONFEREES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, two days ago, when conferees were appointed on the part of the Senate, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] as Republican members. The Senator from Vermont could not be present when the matter was considered by the conferees. So there were three Democratic Senators and one Republican Senator present. It has therefore been suggested that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who is the next ranking Republican on the committee, serve as conferee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] may be appointed as a member of the conference, because of the fact that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] cannot serve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] will be excused from further service and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is appointed to serve as conferee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I now send to the desk a conference report, which has been unanimously approved by the conferees, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'December 31, 1950' in each place it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 31, 1951.'"

"Sec. 2. Section 204 (j) (3) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That as used in this Act the term "resolution" shall not be construed to be limited to ordinances or other legislative acts, and any resolution heretofore adopted by any local governing body is hereby declared to be effective for the purpose of this section 204 (j) (3) or section 204 (f) (1), whether or not such resolution was legislative in character; and no suit or action shall be brought under section 205 of this Act, or any other provision of law, on the basis of any administrative decision or the decision of any court that the resolution described in this Act must be a legislative act.'"

And the House agree to the same.

B. R. MAYBANK,
GLEN TAYLOR,
J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
JOHN W. BRICKER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT W. PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

There being no objection, the report was considered, and agreed to.

COMMUNIQUE REGARDING THE MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not know whether the communiqué which was issued by the White House in regard to the meeting between President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee has been introduced into the RECORD. If it has not, I think it desirable to have it printed in the RECORD, and I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 8, 1950.

Since Prime Minister Attlee arrived in Washington on December 4, six meetings between the President and Mr. Attlee have been held. Among those who participated as advisers to the President were the Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, the Secretary of Defense Gen. George C. Marshall, the Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, the Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General

of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Mr. W. Averell Harriman, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board W. Stuart Symington, and Ambassador-designate Walter S. Gifford. Mr. Attlee's advisers included the British Ambassador, Sir Oliver S. Franks, Field Marshal Sir William Slim, Chief of the Imperial General Staff, Marshal of the Royal Air Force Lord Tedder, Sir Roger Makins and Mr. R. H. Scott of the Foreign Office and Sir Edwin Plowden, Chief of the Economic Planning Staff.

At the conclusion of their conferences, the President and the Prime Minister issued the following joint statement:

We have reviewed together the outstanding problems facing our two countries in international affairs. The objectives of our two nations in foreign policy are the same: to maintain world peace and respect for the rights and interests of all peoples, to promote strength and confidence among the freedom-loving countries of the world, to eliminate the causes of fear, want and discontent, and to advance the democratic way of life.

We first reviewed the changed aspect of world affairs arising from the massive intervention of Chinese communists in Korea. We have discussed the problems of the Far East and the situation as it now presents itself in Europe. We have surveyed the economic problems and the defense programs of our respective countries, and particularly the existing and threatened shortages of raw materials. We have considered the arrangements for the defense of the Atlantic community, and our future course in the United Nations.

The unity of objectives of our two countries underlay all the discussions. There is no difference between us as to the nature of the threat which our countries face or the basic policies which must be pursued to overcome it. We recognize, that many of the problems which we have discussed can only be decided through the procedures of the United Nations or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The peoples of the United States and the United Kingdom will act together with resolution and unity to meet the challenge to peace which recent weeks have made clear to all.

The situation in Korea is one of great gravity and far-reaching consequences. By the end of October, the forces of the United Nations had all but completed the mission set for them by the United Nations "to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area." A free and unified Korea—the objective which the United Nations has long sought—was well on the way to being realized. At that point Chinese Communist forces entered Korea in large numbers, and on November 27 launched a large-scale attack on the United Nations troops. The United Nations forces have the advantage of superior air power and naval support, but on the ground they are confronted by a heavy numerical superiority.

The United Nations forces were sent into Korea on the authority and at the recommendation of the United Nations. The United Nations has not changed the mission which it has entrusted to them and the forces of our two countries will continue to discharge their responsibilities.

We are in complete agreement that there can be no thought of appeasement or of rewarding aggression, whether in the Far East or elsewhere. Lasting peace and the future of the United States as an instrument for world peace depend upon strong support for resistance against aggression.

For our part, we are ready, as we have always been, to seek an end to the hostilities by means of negotiation. The same principles of international conduct should be applied to this situation as are applied, in accordance with our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, to any threat to world peace. Every effort must be made

to achieve the purposes of the United Nations in Korea by peaceful means and to find a solution of the Korean problem on the basis of a free and independent Korea. We are confident that the great majority of the United Nations takes the same view. If the Chinese on their side display any evidence of a similar attitude, we are hopeful that the cause of peace can be upheld. If they do not, then it will be for the peoples of the world, acting through the United Nations, to decide how the principles of the Charter can best be maintained. For our part, we declare in advance our firm resolve to uphold them.

We considered two questions regarding China which are already before the United Nations. On the question of the Chinese seat in the United Nations, the two Governments differ. The United Kingdom has recognized the Central People's Government and considers that its representatives should occupy China's seat in the United Nations. The United States has opposed, and continues to oppose, the seating of the Chinese Communist representatives in the United Nations. We have discussed our difference of view on this point and are determined to prevent it from interfering with our united effort in support of our common objectives.

On the question of Formosa, we have noted that both Chinese claimants have insisted upon the validity of the Cairo Declaration and have expressed reluctance to have the matter considered by the United Nations. We agreed that the issues should be settled by peaceful means and in such a way as to safeguard the interests of the people of Formosa and the maintenance of peace and security in the Pacific, and that consideration of this question by the United Nations will contribute to these ends.

The free nations of Asia have given strong support to the United Nations and have worked for world peace. Communist aggression in Korea increases the danger to the security and independence of these nations. We reaffirm our intention to continue to help them.

The pressure of Communist expansion existed in Europe and elsewhere long before the aggression against Korea, and measures were taken to meet it. The need to strengthen the forces of collective security had already been recognized and action for this purpose is under way. Clearly, decisions regarding the Far East have their repercussions and effects elsewhere. In considering the necessities of the far eastern situation, we have kept in mind the urgency of building up the strength of the whole free world. We are in complete agreement on the need for immediate action by all the North Atlantic Treaty countries to intensify their efforts to build up their defenses and to strengthen the Atlantic community.

We recognize that adequate defense forces are essential if war is to be prevented.

Accordingly we have reached the following conclusions:

1. The military capabilities of the United States and the United Kingdom should be increased as rapidly as possible.
2. The two countries should expand the production of arms which can be used by the forces of all the free nations that are joined together in common defense. Together with those other nations, the United States and the United Kingdom should continue to work out mutual arrangements by which all will contribute appropriately to the common defense.

We agreed that as soon as the plan now nearing completion in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for an effective integrated force for the defense of Europe is approved, a supreme commander should be appointed. It is our joint desire that this appointment shall be made soon.

In addition to these decisions on increasing our military strength, we have agreed that the maintenance of healthy civilian

economies is of vital importance to the success of our defense efforts. We agreed that, while defense production must be given the highest practicable priority in the case of raw materials whose supply is inadequate, the essential civilian requirements of the free countries must be met so far as practicable. In order to obtain the necessary materials and to devote them as rapidly as possible to these priority purposes, we have agreed to work closely together for the purpose of increasing supplies of raw materials. We have recognized the necessity of international action to assure that basic raw materials are distributed equitably in accordance with defense and essential civilian needs. We discussed certain immediate problems of raw-materials shortages and consideration of these specific matters will continue. We are fully conscious of the increasing necessity of preventing materials and items of strategic importance from flowing into the hands of those who might use them against the free world.

In the circumstances which confront us throughout the world our nations have no other choice but to devote themselves with all vigor to the building up of our defense forces. We shall do this purely as a defensive measure. We believe that the Communist leaders of the Soviet Union and China could, if they chose, modify their conduct in such a way as to make these defense preparations unnecessary. We shall do everything that we can, through whatever channels are open to us, to impress this view upon them and to seek a peaceful solution of existing issues.

The President stated that it was his hope that world conditions would never call for the use of the atomic bomb. The President told the Prime Minister that it was also his desire to keep the Prime Minister at all times informed of developments which might bring about a change in the situation.

In this critical period, it is a source of satisfaction to us that the views of our governments on basic problems are so similar. We believe that this identity of aims will enable our governments to carry out their determination to work together to strengthen the unity which has already been achieved among the free nations and to defend those values which are of fundamental importance to the people we represent.

SUPPORT OF OUR KOREAN FORCES BY COMMANDERS OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this morning's press carried a release and a statement issued by the national commanders of four great veterans' groups with respect to the determination of the veterans of the United States to stand by the fighting forces in Korea.

The release is very short, and I should like to read it into the RECORD, by way of calling the attention of the Senate to the release and to their position:

WASHINGTON, December 7.—President Truman was urged today by leaders of the four major veterans' organizations to authorize General MacArthur to use all necessary means, including aerial strikes across the Manchurian border, to save his troops from disaster.

The plea was contained in a letter to the President signed by National Commander Erle Coker, Jr., of the American Legion; Commander in Chief Charles C. Ralls, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; National Commander Boniface R. Maille, of the Disabled American Veterans; and National Commander Harold Russell, of AMVETS.

The four veterans' chiefs also cabled the text of their joint declaration to General

MacArthur in Tokyo. They notified MacArthur: "At your complete discretion, if you care to relay this message to the troops, we would be delighted."

Their appeal to the President follows.

This is the quoted appeal:

We, the national commanders of the four largest veterans' organizations, feel called upon to make the following declaration:

We are deeply concerned over the situation in Korea, where 150,000 American troops are fighting against overwhelming odds.

We veterans of previous wars understand the terrific odds faced by our combat troops in Korea. No one knows how many GI's have died because of imposed limitations which have prevented them from fighting on equal terms with the Communist aggressors. These Godless hordes know no laws and have no restrictions.

Every step must be taken to increase the chance of survival of our fighting men. They must be given all possible help. They must not be curbed by restrictions and delays which will lead to unnecessary casualties. They must not be abandoned to disaster. They must not be sacrificed to delusions of appeasement.

We urge the constituted authorities of the free world through the United Nations, to take these actions now. We urge them to make available every means to save our men, including an authorization to send aircraft across the Manchurian border to bomb vital military targets. We urge that the President, through the United Nations, give General MacArthur full authority to employ such means as may be necessary to save our troops from disaster.

We cannot, we must not, let these fighting men down.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether the Senator heard the United Press report from Korea this morning? The United Press conducted among the Marines fighting in Korea, a poll as to whether they would desire the use of the atomic bomb. Perhaps it is not surprising to know that they thought it would be a most excellent medium, in their judgment, and they were unanimously and enthusiastically in favor of its use to assist in saving their lives.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not see that report, but I would not want a lack of comment by me to make my position misunderstood. I can readily understand the desire of the fighting men in Korea, who are involved in one of the greatest catastrophes which ever has overtaken American arms at any time, to have all and any available arms and weapons brought to their aid for their support and to help extricate them from the terrible position in which they find themselves.

It happens to be my own personal view that the use of an atomic weapon is a question of very vital strategic importance and determination. Whether there is a strategic target or whether there are strategic targets in that area which would justify or warrant the use of an atomic weapon is a question to be decided by highly capable and competent military authority.

Again I say that I am utterly sympathetic with these fighting men, who want brought to their assistance every weapon which can be of substantial aid. However, I believe that the use of an

atomic weapon is a matter which must be carefully considered, must be fully advised, and must be strategically practical before it is used.

I am not saying that it should be used or that it should not be used, but I say that is a matter for local, on-the-ground evaluation as to, perhaps I might say, the decisiveness of the results of the use of that weapon. Whenever it can be materially decisive for victory, I say it should be used. If it is not a decisive weapon, then undoubtedly there are other weapons which might be used, I assume.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Iowa familiar with the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, first, that since the Congress has entrusted the atomic bomb to the President, he is the one who has to determine, in the first instance, whether the general who is on the ground, General MacArthur, should have authority in his discretion to use it?

I do not know whether the Senator has read the release this afternoon, but it seems to indicate very clearly that the President has reserved that right from the United Nations. I hope that is a proper construction of what he said; I think it should be the construction.

The only suggestion the Senator from Maine has ever made has been that the President might in his judgment deem it wise to give General MacArthur authority to use it—as I understand that the bombs are there—if at any time he should deem that it was helpful to the situation he faces.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, Congress has charged the President with the authority to determine as to the release of atomic weapons. The President in the exercise of that authority I believe must authorize the use of atomic weapons, if and when the use of such weapons will contribute to the decisiveness of our success. According to my view, that happens to be a highly technical decision which has to be made by those who have the ability to evaluate the decisiveness of the use of the weapon. With all due respect to the President, I feel that he, in and of his own training and experience, is not sufficiently self-informed. I have no doubt that the President will receive and will accept the advice of those who are technically trained and informed in the probable decisiveness of the use of the weapon, in connection with any authorization which he may give.

I understand the position of the Senator from Maine.

I did not intend to discuss at this time, Mr. President, the use of that weapon; but I will say that the statement of these four commanders of great veterans' organizations today expresses strongly, I think, the complete opinion and the complete unity of the American people that not only must every effort be made to protect the American fighting men who today are in Korea, but every effort must be made to maintain the ideals of freedom for which they are dying and for which their comrades who do not die are fighting. I think there must be no appeasement. We have had enough of

appeasement and the disasters that flow from it.

I say to you, Mr. President, that although there is indication that in the State Department of this Government appeasement is still the major effort and major policy, if appeasement continues to be the dominating policy of the State Department and of the Nation, nothing but utter catastrophe to the American system and to free men everywhere can flow in the very near future.

This is the time for principles to be announced, and for the free American people to stand vigorously and clearly in defense of the principles of freedom, if we are to have freedom for our posterity and even perhaps for the later years of our own lives.

I commend the statement by these four great commanders of their organizations, and I commend to the serious thought and consideration not only of the Senate, but of all the American people, the import of this statement and this declaration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said:

Mr. President, I have just been handed by a page a copy of a telegram from General MacArthur to Erle Cocke, Jr., the national commander of the American Legion. I have not previously known about the telegram, and I should like to have it go into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. If I may do so at this time, I shall read the telegram, which is short:

ERLE COCKE, JR.,
National Commander,
The American Legion,
Washington, D. C.:

Accept and convey to Commanders Ralls, C. M. A. Maille, and Russell my profound gratitude for the understanding reflected in your inspiring message of the sixth. The fighting men of this war will find much added strength in this demonstration of invincible support from the veterans of the last.

MACARTHUR,
Commander in Chief,
United Nations Command.

TOKYO.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Maine, if he will give me his attention, that the United Nations have never had the right or the power to determine which of the weapons in our arsenal we should use in the defense of the security of the United States. Any commander in chief who has the right, as our President has under the law, to determine the use of this awesome weapon will, I am sure, be guided by our own military advice, and will bring to its use a prayerful consideration of military and psychological factors.

The Senator from Maine was not present recently when I made a statement in answer to a twice-affirmed conviction of his, based upon an assurance that is supposed to have been given by Dr. Karl Compton, that the Russians are not in possession of the atomic bomb. I told the Senate—and the Senator will find the statement in the Record—that the intelligence that was available to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was directly to the contrary. I wanted the Senator from Maine to know that.

I have been informed by a reporter that Dr. Compton was interviewed on Sunday, and stated—I myself have not seen his remarks as carried in the press—that, while at one time he had made such a statement, he had not done so within the past few years. I merely want to inform the Senator from Maine of that fact.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad the Senator from Connecticut brought up the matter, as I was not present previously when he discussed it. I have not had an opportunity to examine the Record. I am familiar with the statements of the Senator from Connecticut as to his opinion, and that, I gather, of some of his associate, that the Russians possess this weapon.

Mr. McMAHON. If I may interrupt, Mr. President, since I still have the floor, I do not wish the Senator to introduce the casual note that a restricted number of persons—"some of the members of the joint committee"—entertain this belief. Let the Senator from Maine be informed that, so far as I know, it is the unanimous judgment of the 18 members of the joint committee, for which I speak, and it is the unanimous opinion of the Board of Evaluation of the Government of the United States, so far as I am advised, and I believe I am correctly advised. I merely want the Senator from Maine to entertain no doubt at all about the overwhelming weight of opinion on this subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was very much intrigued by the statement of Dr. Compton, of which I have a copy, and which I shall be glad to put into the Record, for, although he made the statement to which the Senator from Connecticut refers, namely, that he had at some time possibly expressed a doubt, he would not have said that, following the President's statement a year ago, the Russians had the atomic bomb.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be very glad—

Mr. BREWSTER. Just a moment, please.

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment; I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Connecticut, but had not recognized the Senator from Maine.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to say I was informed by a reporter that the Senator from Maine said that after a review of his records he would produce for the Record Dr. Compton's statement. I think this debate between the Senator from Maine and myself has little meaning at this point. I am informed, I may say to the Senator from Maine, that Dr. Compton was one of those who reviewed evidence which was available to the evaluators for our Government, and he concurred in their evaluation. I do not assert that upon my own responsibility, but that information comes from a highly creditable source.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Dr. Compton, in his statement—which, as I say, I shall be glad to put in the RECORD; I think I can quote it exactly—said that he did not recall his statement, for it was made some time ago, but that if he had made it, he did not say “years”; he said “some time ago”; and that in any event he would not have made that statement after the President’s announcement, a year ago, that the Russians now had the atomic bomb.

The only curious part of that statement is that the President never made such a statement. It may be the opinion—and I am quite willing to accept the assurances of the Senator from Connecticut, which have been repeatedly advanced with an insistence which sometimes has seemed to me a little extreme, if the assurances are as great as he would indicate—that the Russians have the bomb. The President, in his famous statement of August or September 14, 1949, I believe it was, did not say that the Russians have the atom bomb. I hope the Senator from Connecticut is familiar with that point, as he will be if he will read the statement.

My attention was not called to this matter until after the repeated statements by the Senator from Connecticut. It may be that the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, is quite persuaded to the opinion the Senator from Connecticut has repeatedly advanced. All I say is that up to today he has not made such a statement at any time. When he released his statement, it was extremely carefully drawn, I feel sure. I think the words were not chosen by inadvertence. If the Senator from Connecticut is familiar with this matter, as I believe he is—and certainly as he ought to be—he knows that the words in the President’s statement were drawn very carefully so as not to say that the Russians had the atomic bomb. Is the Senator from Connecticut familiar with that?

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, I ask the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. In answer to the Senator from Maine, I may say I am very familiar with the terminology which was used in the President’s statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Maine correct?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not understand the vehemence of the Senator from Maine upon the subject. I have not at any time in the Senate quoted the President’s statement in any statement I made relating to the matter, since the 23d day of September 1949.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator used it just now. The Senator said the Government of the United States was persuaded. That is the President.

Mr. McMAHON. I referred to the persons with whom I have had contact relative to this matter. I do not intend to debate it with the Senator from Maine, because that would take me into matters which probably would have to be discussed with the joint committee before they could be discussed more fully on the floor of the Senate.

I am fully aware that the statement of September 23, 1949, referred to the incident, to the event, as an atomic explosion. All I say to the Senator, on my own responsibility and as chairman of the joint committee, is that after listening to the information furnished by our intelligence officers, I not only say to the Senator that I am persuaded, but I say to him that I believe that it is the opinion of our coworkers, both on his side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle, that the event described in the release of September 23 was the explosion of an atomic bomb.

I see no point in further laboring the matter. If the Senator from Maine wishes to cherish the idea and delusion that that is not the fact, he is perfectly welcome to do it. In my position, I feel a responsibility to state what my belief is and what the belief of the other members of the joint committee is. That is all there is to it.

Furthermore, I wish to say that so far as Dr. Compton is concerned, I particularly said that I have not seen the release upon which the Senator from Maine relies. I merely reiterated what I had been told by a newspaperman as to what Dr. Compton had said about the assurance which he was supposed to have given in a public release, as voiced by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine wants to believe what he has stated, let him believe it; I do not care. I think I have a responsibility to the Senate and to the American people to state the facts as I know them. The Senator from Maine need not become excited about it. As a matter of fact, the Senator may believe just what he wants to believe; it is all right with me.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the courtesy. I shall continue to exercise that proud privilege of every American. I am very much intrigued, indeed, to know that the Senator from Connecticut is familiar with all that has been said on this subject by these important persons. I further understand that when the President made his statement he did not even use the word “bomb,” but he said they had evidence that there had been an atomic explosion in Russia. That is not the same as stating that the Russians have control of the atomic bomb, as the Senator from Connecticut knows exceedingly well.

Whether any significance was to be attached to the language which was used, I do not know. It did not attract my attention until the statement of Dr. Compton came to my attention, and it then led me to an inference that there might be some question regarding this matter. Certainly this is not any time to underestimate Russia’s strength. On the other hand, it is equally desirable that the American people shall have the benefit of all the knowledge and all the views which are available. I am still somewhat puzzled as to why Dr. Compton, even in his statement, did not himself state that he was persuaded that the Russians had the atomic bomb. I do not know whether that is his opinion today. In view of the amount of information which has become available to the Russians, through the various acts of treason

that have occurred, I would assume that it is very likely that the Russians might have achieved the development of the atomic bomb.

It is clear, however—and I think even the distinguished Chairman of the Atomic Energy Joint Commission agrees—that at the present time we have a considerable superiority in this weapon. At any rate, I have never seen that statement challenged.

If the Russians have control of this secret, other than having in the course of their experimentation occasioned an explosion, undoubtedly they are moving as rapidly as possible to facilitate the development and the production of these bombs; and it is very likely that whatever advantage we now enjoy is to some extent being reduced, and that the extent to which we surpass Russia today in the development of atomic power is not so great as was the case a year ago, and will be even less 2 years from now or 3 years from now.

It seems to me that it is appropriate not only for the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, but for all citizens of America whose sons may be obliged to pay the price of our difficulties, and for our European friends, as well, who shudder at the contemplation of the atomic bomb, to take into account that our ratio of leadership in this field today may be 10 to 1, but tomorrow may be 5 to 1. All of us should take that situation into account, in determining whether it is wise to postpone the evil day when the atomic war may finally come.

Certainly there is nothing in the record thus far to justify the impression that when, as, and if the Russians possess the atomic bomb in adequate supply they will not move and strike. On that score I cite the opinion of Winston Churchill, who I am certain is recognized as an authority on Russian psychology. He said:

The only thing that holds the hands of the Russians today in Europe or elsewhere is the superiority of America in the atomic bomb, for which we are profoundly grateful to Almighty God.

Why it should be so disturbing to point out that Dr. Compton at one time expressed doubt as to whether Russia had the bomb, that President Truman in his famous statement did not say the Russians now did possess control of this awful weapon, and whether any significance should be attached to his carefully limited language, I do not know. I am simply one person who feels it is appropriate that we should consider all the facts and information which are permitted to come to the attention of the Members of the Senate, of Congress, and of the country. On the basis of such information the American people themselves must ultimately decide as to the wisdom of the moves which we may deem it best to make.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o’clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o’clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate

took a recess until Monday, December 11, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 8 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy, O4655 (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

NOTE.—Above named officer was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 5th day of June 1951:

Joe L. Akagi	Wesley A. Johnson
Merle L. Anderson	Albert J. Kacoroski
Nell A. Armstrong	George Kinsel
Gerald R. Bell	Armand R. Langlais
Ralph S. Colby	Stephen J. Ledogar
Melvin H. Davidow	Freeman L. Lofton
Jerry F. Detwiler	Frank R. MacKinnis
John R. Eckstein	James C. Miller
David J. Ellison	Herman C. Quittmeyer
Donald R. Frazor	Fred R. Robson
Rodman W. Gaines, Jr.	Kenneth A. Schechter
Donald A. Gardner	Lester R. Smith
Herbert A. Graham, Jr.	David S. Stephenson
William E. Hastings	Thomas R. Thompson
Winston R. Hayes	Glenn W. Yearous
George B. Hogaboom	Edmund K. Zahn

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 5th day of June 1951:

Carlos P. Baker, Jr.	William G. McCormick
Arthur F. Barns	Theodore K. McCourry
John B. Bierman	Richard O. McNeerney
Robert R. Boone	Lawrence G. Mische
Loren C. Borgwardt	John H. Peterson
Donald E. Chelew	Robert L. Pfeiff
Thomas J. Dixon	Richard E. Powell
Gilbert R. Fornatora	Thomas C. Fuller
Thomas C. Fuller	Tom M. Reese
Robert J. Gibbons	Roger L. Rosback
Elmer W. Gielow	James A. Rose
Charles H. Golden	William E. Ross
Lacy B. Herrmann	Paul D. Saylor, Jr.
Arthur F. Hooper	Rodney L. Stewart
Raymond D. Johnson	Mark E. Trivison
Robert C. Jung	Marvin P. Watkins
James C. Landkamer	Clarence L. Watson
Joseph C. Landwehr	Herbert H. Weidensaul
Gordon A. Lauanders	Harold F. Wiley
Marks A. Levy	Richard N. Willse
Wayne P. Libhart	

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

William C. Becker	Emerson M. Harris
John W. Carrigan	Christopher J. Kelly

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Ralph R. Bittner	William D. Gosch
John L. Brooks	Price P. Harding
Richard Cowley	Robert E. Monahan, Jr.
Edouard V. Cooksey	Robert M. Powell
Briggs B. Edney, Jr.	Ned A. Rogoway
Edward P. Ellington	Stuart X. Stephenson, Jr.
Joseph G. Fitzgibbons, Jr.	
Everett E. Frizzell	Maurice H. Stoffer
Thomas E. Gallagher	Robert T. Whitlock
Norman LeR. Glorgini	

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

James L. Eckmann	Frank W. Keeney
Donald E. Huebner	Ross P. Williams, Jr.

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950 in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Burton H. Jones
Sidney Y. McAden, Jr.

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of June 1951:

James L. Black, Jr.	William A. Henshaw
Charles R. Browder	Robert C. Herklots
Robert P. Chaney	Edward K. Maxwell
Robert G. Christensen	Ronald W. Olson
Leonard W. Deden	Richard C. Stockton

The following-named (civilian college graduates) for temporary or permanent appointment to the grades and corps indicated.

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, MEDICAL CORPS

Henry T. Ash
Edward A. Jones

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, MEDICAL CORPS

Howard A. Baker	John R. Palmer, Jr.
Joseph J. Connor	James L. Spencer
Harry P. Mahlin	John R. Wassell
Edward R. Nell	

Lieutenants, Medical Corps

Henry T. Ash	Maurice R. Schmoyer, Jr.
Edward A. Jones	
Laurence G. Roth	Robert W. Spicher

Lieutenants (junior grade), Medical Corps

William C. Adams, Jr.	John B. Hodo
Jaime N. Benavides	Paul G. Hoveman
Jr.	Arthur P. Kaupe
George A. Brennan	Martin H. Klein
Gerald Brill	Mortimer B. Marcus
Edward A. Carlin, Jr.	James W. Phillips
Ronald A. Cummings	Theodore Safford, Jr.
Harold A. Davis	John B. Stotler
John A. Glaubke	Edwin R. Wallace III

Lieutenants (junior grade), Chaplain Corps

Edward J. Dunn	Stanley C. Limanowski
Charlie R. Harrison	Willie D. Powell
Dean A. Kaufman	

Lieutenants, Dental Corps

Will F. Graham
Donald C. Hawkins
Francis N. Johnston

Lieutenants (junior grade), Dental Corps

Alvin C. Bertucci	Oliver G. Nystul
Victor E. Bird	John F. O'Connor
Everett B. Blanton, Jr.	John J. O'Loughlin
Louis H. Cordonier	Edward E. Packard
Lucian J. Cuprak	Vincent A. Schaefer
William J. Duensing	Richard W. Short
William C. Hopkins	Carl H. Wilkens, Jr.

The following-named enlisted men of the Navy to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Dwight J. Adams	Harry C. Gibbons, Jr.
Lucien E. Barkley	Barney O. Green
Melvin D. Bergquist, Jr.	Robert J. Hanavan
Leland M. Biggs	Dallas C. Harvey
Francis R. Bobek	William H. Jones
Clifford W. Boggs	Daniel L. Kelly
George A. Boone	James D. Kelly
Warren G. Bowe	Milton E. Koepke
Harvey F. Bryant	Ernest S. Kramer
Charles A. Carr, Jr.	Dexter J. Lacy
Ray W. Conrad	Ralph H. Laedtke
John C. Courtney	Thomas G. Leach, Jr.
Eugene H. Dempewolf	Raymond W. Lee
John S. Denningham	Vincent E. Lind
Thomas A. Devins	William A. McDonough
Richard G. DeWitt	Lowell H. McKerley
Carl F. Dinwiddie	Talmadge G. McMahon
William S. Duffey	William G. Marsh, Jr.
Laverne W. Gay	Walter C. Merrell
Jack H. Gehring	Edwin B. Miller
	William J. Morgan, Jr.

Reld F. Murray, Jr.
Richard R. Newton
Earl M. Nicholson
Raymond A. Nygren
Bernard J. Pfau
Donald L. Phelps
John D. Pruitt
Rodney R. Rever
Garnet G. Sandeen
James M. Sanders

Thomas N. Scales, Jr.
Albert J. Schwab
Thomas R. Stiles
James F. Stuart
James R. Swindal
Stanley E. Sykes
Robert E. Thompson
Albert D. Warner
Frank A. Zaller

The following named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Phyllis M. Anderson	Katherine J. Metz
Joan L. Barron	Lorraine M. Meyer
Geraldine L. Becraft	Joyce L. Miller
Olivia G. Boyd	Jeanne T. Moffitt
Thelma J. Brophy	Frances F. Morgan
Annie R. Bruton	Loretta T. Mühlenfeld
Migdalia Camacho	Adeline Nicora
Geraldine M. Carey	Barbara A. Noonan
Audrey M. Cassanova	Elisku E. Pavoucek
Marian B. Clark	Virginia M. Pike
Alice P. Cline	Wilda R. Ragland
Mary L. Connolly	Margarete Riecken
Opal J. Cooper	Josie Rock
Florence V. Craig	Helen Semanisin
Catherine E. Dennis	Shirley R. Severson
Kathleen M. Dunn	Mary H. Shafer
Marie Eberhardt	Rose E. Shrout
Laura S. Elliott	Lois J. Simkins
Barbara O. Fitz	Donna J. Smith
Ellen B. Frame	Mildred I. Snyder
Luella Freeman	Elizabeth V. N. Span-
Mary A. Gelbmann	gler
Carolyn E. Green	Elizabeth F. Sprowles
Veronica J. Hagmann	Jacqueline L. Starry
Juanita J. Hahn	Adelaide Stilwell
Joan Hancock	Mary R. Struble
Anna M. Hanley	Harriet E. Sullivan
Betty S. Hedrick	Lucille B. Theriot
Dolores A. Henkel	Kathleen G. Turner
Colleen Hinckley	Clara B. Turpin
Betty R. Krintz	Wanda D. Underwood
Mildred R. Levin	Dorothy LaV. Vining
Helen F. McGorry	Harriette L. Wakeman
Madeline M. MacDon-	Bertha M. Walbert
ald	Mary B. Wheeler
Rosalie S. Martin	Ellen J. Whelan
Eudora G. Mason	Alice K. Williams
Rose M. Melendez	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

James H. L. Chambers, Jr.
Gregory J. Clizek
Roy W. Riegle, Jr.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Virginia Caley	Patricia A. Maas
Elaine T. Carville	Mary S. Mock
Anna B. Jenkins	Natalie Noble
Barbara B. Kasdorf	Lois M. O'Connor
Joan M. D. McCormick	Joan P. O'Neill
	Margaret L. O'Neill

The following-named enlisted woman of the Marine Corps to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Dorothy H. Dawson

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Robert H. Brown
Charles A. Patterson

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Marjorie J. Donnelly	Delma U. Linville
Carrie M. Ebert	Marie A. Pongratz
Edna I. Fetterman	

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Mary V. Finn
Ruth E. Kennedy

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, without whose divine guidance we cannot carry on, we pray that the life of men and nations everywhere may be touched and transformed by a greater fidelity to Thee.

We penitently confess that we so frequently forget and forsake Thee. We fail to see that our supreme loyalty is to Thee and that this is the source and basis and inspiration of all other loyalties, the fidelity of the soul to its better self and to truth, of the loyalty of patriot to country, of friend to friend, of man to man, and of nation to nation.

Help us to understand that our tragic world problem is not primarily one of human or international relationship but that it is something far more basic and fundamental. May we see that it is the problem of bringing man into an obedient relationship to Thee.

Grant that we may realize more fully that all our efforts to achieve good will and a lasting peace will be vain and futile unless humanity is brought into a glad and willing obedience to Thee and Thy divine will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) entitled "Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended"; agrees to a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. FLANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXEMPTING FURLOUGH TRAVEL FROM TAX

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9840) to exempt furlough travel of service personnel from the tax on transportation of persons.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill but I might offer this explanation.

This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. It has been amended. The bill, as amended, would exempt personnel of the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard and authorized cadets and midshipmen traveling in uniform of the United States from the tax on transportation of persons when they are traveling at reduced

round-trip fares at their own expense while on official leave, furlough, or pass.

The bill as introduced, however, would have permitted the same privilege for members of the United Nations representatives; the privilege is not extended to members of the United Nations as the bill is now amended.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. When the committee met yesterday it was indicated by the drafting force that they would have some difficulty in preparing this language. I take it, of course, now that the drafting force has agreed to everything that has been done as we agreed in committee yesterday.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9840, as amended, would extend to personnel of the armed services traveling on furlough in uniform the same tax exemption that was in effect during World War II in the case of round-trip fares purchased at reduced rates at their own expense.

All railroads in the United States have recently announced that they will offer military personnel a 2-cent-per-mile special rate, effective from December 15, 1950, to January 10, 1951, inclusive.

The Secretary of Defense is in favor of the bill, and early enactment is imperative if the exemption is to be available for holiday travel of service personnel.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not understand exactly the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] a moment ago. This does not apply to the so-called representatives of the United Nations, does it?

Mr. REED of New York. It does not, as amended.

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad to know that.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Does this apply only when a soldier is traveling on a reduced-rate ticket or on any ticket?

Mr. REED of New York. On any ticket when he is in uniform and traveling on furlough.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It applies when the person is on furlough and in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I might mention that this is a unanimous report of the committee and it is recommended by the Secretary of Defense.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act of August 8, 1947, entitled "An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II" (61 Stat. 919) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 2. Section 3469 (f) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby reenacted, to read as follows:

"(2) Exemption of members of military and naval service: The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to the payment for transportation or facilities furnished under

special tariffs providing for fares of not more than 1¼ cents per mile applicable to round trip tickets sold to personnel of the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard traveling in uniform of the United States, or to members of the military or naval forces of any of the other United Nations traveling in uniform of such nation, at their own expense when on official leave, furlough, or pass, including authorized cadets and midshipmen, issued on presentation of properly executed certificate."

Sec. 3. This act shall take effect from and after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That effective with respect to amounts paid after the date of enactment of this act—

"(a) Section 12 of the act of August 8, 1947, entitled 'An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II' (61 Stat. 919), is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 3469 (f) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Exemption of members of military and naval service: The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to the payment for transportation or facilities furnished under special tariffs providing for fares of not more than 2 cents per mile applicable to round-trip tickets sold to personnel of the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard traveling in uniform of the United States at their own expense when on official leave, furlough, or pass, including authorized cadets and midshipmen, issued on presentation of properly executed certificate."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good measure. I feel that any break this Congress can give to the men in uniform ought to be given to them. During World War II I introduced a measure to give free transportation to the men in uniform when they were on furlough. That bill gained considerable interest in the Congress. I believe it would have been passed, had we been able to get enough impetus behind it before the war ended. This particular measure, as I understand, will result in giving to young men who are on furloughs and who need transportation a reduced rate on the railroads. For that reason it seems to me it ought to be passed. It is one of the most commendable measures I have seen come before the House during the Eighty-first Congress. However, it does not go as far as I would like to have it. I would like to have a furlough pass issued to each man in service so that when he is granted a furlough he can have the opportunity, at least once a year, of using that pass on any mode of transportation he chooses so that he can get to and from his home. But half a loaf or a quarter of a loaf is better than none, and I am glad to see the members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress interested in the young men in service to the point where we can get a measure of this type before the House.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the tax exempt on tickets purchased for what we might call first-class passage, riding in Pull-

mans, or does it apply only to coach tickets?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I would assume it would apply to coach tickets. I am not informed as to the details of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the way it looks to me; and if that is true, I do not think the statement made in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is correct.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I heard the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee give an outline of the bill, and as I understood it, it was to benefit the buck privates more than anyone else. I am glad to see the rank and file get benefits which they should have had during World War II. Not many GI's have a chance to use Pullmans anyway.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, I gladly yield.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. You spoke of the buck privates. What about the does?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I presume this bill applies to men and women alike who are in uniform. It certainly should, anyway. At any rate, I am glad to see this measure brought up, because I have some little pride as I was one of the first in pioneering this type of legislation, and I am very happy to see it brought before the House today. I hope it is passed unanimously.

During World War II, several thousand women in the triple-cities area, in Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, organized groups of servicemen's wives, sisters, mothers, and sweethearts, and banded together into what they called Hall Furlough Clubs.

Their primary objectives consisted of giving militant support to my free furlough bill and also to actively aiding their soldier relatives.

While the Hall Furlough Clubs did not become national in character, they were indeed powerful in the triple cities and did a fine patriotic work in maintaining a splendid spirit on our home front.

So effective were these Hall Furlough Clubs in promoting Americanism and helping service people in general that it leads me to believe some similar group should be promoted at the present time.

Certainly the triple cities were better off for such activities, and our local young men benefited tremendously because of the marvelous spirit of these patriotic ladies.

I am giving serious thought to assisting the folks back home, if any want to join with me in such a movement, now that so many thousands of patriots are once again donning uniforms and leaving for training camps and battlefields.

Let us hope I can serve them in a somewhat similar capacity as I did in World War II.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD GARDNER

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I rise to announce to the Members of the House of Representatives the death of Edward Gardner, a former Congressman from the Third District of the State of Ohio.

Mr. Gardner very ably and energetically represented the Third Ohio District in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Prior to his splendid record of service in this honorable body, he faithfully and diligently served the citizens of his native city of Hamilton, Ohio, as president of the city council and as a State representative, and in more recent years he served as Butler County Democratic chairman.

Mr. Gardner's fine record remains as a glowing and lasting tribute of service. His death is a loss to our district, State, and Nation, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe it fitting and proper that the House of Representatives rise for a moment of prayerful silence to pay tribute to a former colleague.

To Mr. Gardner and to his son Edward and his daughter Patricia Marie I would like to sympathetically add that we too will miss him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREEN] has expired.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the sad news which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREEN] brings to the House saddens me greatly. The death of our former colleague and my very good friend, Edward Gardner, is a shock to me.

Ed Gardner and I entered Congress at the same time. Early in the Seventy-ninth Congress I formed a close friendship with him. I learned to know him well—to know something of his principles and to know his fine character. He was a fine man; a splendid public servant. He was sincere in everything he did; honest and conscientious.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREEN] has stated, he served the citizens of his district well, and prior to coming to Congress he was a faithful and diligent official in his home community of Hamilton, Ohio. He had a long and honorable career in public service in Ohio.

I, too, offer my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Edward Gardner was an outstanding citizen of Ohio. He had represented the Third District of Ohio in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

As a Member of Congress he served his constituents and the Nation with fidelity and zeal. The public services and record of Edward Gardner have endeared him to many people in my State.

Before his service as a Member of Congress he had represented Butler County in the General Assembly of Ohio, and at one time he was President of the City Council of Hamilton, Ohio. He was a faithful public servant.

On many occasions I met him personally. He was a prominent party leader in southern Ohio. He was a man of great ability. In addition to that he was a citizen well respected by everyone and held in the highest esteem by his neighbors and friends.

His thousands of friends in Ohio were shocked over his untimely passing.

He proved his friendship to me many times during his useful life. I join with others in extending my sympathy to his wife, to his son, and to his daughter. He was not only a distinguished Member of Congress, but in addition was a good citizen, a good neighbor, a good husband and father, and a good friend.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the Congress when Mr. Gardner was here. I knew him well and favorably. He was a man of fine parts and great ability and good character. He represented the Dayton district and he represented it with honor and dignity. I am sorry indeed to hear of his passing. I extend my most sympathetic regards to those of his family who survive him. He was one of nature's noblemen.

NO SECRET AGREEMENTS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have had so much tragedy in the Far East that our hearts are torn every moment of our days and nights. To me it is very important that we stress our right as citizens of a free country to know what is said at these talks between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Despite many requests for accurate information, we have never had such a report of the conference that was held between President Truman and General MacArthur in the Pacific. If this country is to unite, if the people are to support a program of high taxes and increasingly difficult living, we must know what is being done to us, what commitments are being made that will affect the Nation, our fighting forces and the world as a whole.

"IFS" THAT WOULD PREVENT WAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if every Member of the House of Representatives, every Member of the United States Senate, Cabinet officers, and President who sanctioned war in Korea, China, India,

any place in Asia, in Europe, in Africa, had to go to the front lines to fight, would we have any war?

If all the generals, admirals, colonels, majors, and so forth, had to go to the front-line trenches in Korea or any place else in the world, would we have any war?

If you asked the mothers, fathers, sisters, aunts of the boys at the front if we should have war, if their boys had to be killed in the front-line trenches, would they vote us into war? Emphatically not.

America is doing 95 percent of the fighting, 95 percent of the paying for the war in Korea. What for? Why? Making this effort is the most senseless, foolish war in all history. Over 30,000 casualties to this time. A war of bullies, not of diplomats.

These Asiatics have been fighting each other periodically for centuries. We cannot settle their differences, nor can we, by diplomatic means only, stop them from fighting.

Why kill our boys by getting into this mess? If you win the Korean war, you will start the work of rehabilitation only to find you will have to do this job over. Let the missionaries and churches work from here on to Christianize the world.

I have condemned the State Department and Foreign Affairs Committee for their actions.

I am against arming the 14 Atlantic Pact nations. It will lead to war, not prevent it. It will lead to bankruptcy, not prevent it. It will lead to hardships, not prevent them.

Little lending, curb your spending, and no giving.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday, December 19, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to address the house for 30 minutes on Tuesday, December 12, after the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

A MISLEADING AND INEFFECTUAL GESTURE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association, meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, this week, has just appropriated \$500,000 to aid the Nation's medical schools in their present extreme financial crisis.

I want to advise the Members of this House that this \$500,000 donation is a Trojan gift—serving no purpose but that of fatal indecision and inaction on our part.

The sum involved is about 1 percent of the minimum needs of America's med-

ical schools. It is almost meaningless when you consider the sums that are necessary to keep these vital schools in operation and the still greater sums required to expand them to train doctors for our total military, civilian defense, and ordinary civilian requirements.

More than a year ago the Senate passed unanimously a bill authorizing a 5-year \$250,000,000 program to meet the minimum needs of medical colleges and other schools training professional health personnel.

The AMA, however, has successfully prevented this measure from coming to a floor vote in the House. It has been the sole opponent of a measure which its own best-informed members, the deans of the medical colleges, have overwhelmingly endorsed.

The AMA has claimed time and again that the financial crisis in our medical schools could be met with private aid. Yet all efforts to obtain such aid have failed. A \$500,000 contribution does not change that situation in the slightest.

I agree absolutely, however, with two of the statements made by Dr. Louis H. Bauer, chairman of the AMA's board of trustees, when he announced the appropriation of the \$500,000.

He quite correctly remarked that "many medical schools, if they were assured a solvent future, would increase their enrollment now." He is also correct in noting that "the financing of medical schools is one of the most pressing problems facing the medical professions today."

A study of the needs of the medical schools of this country as prepared by a committee of deans and other experts shows that about \$10,000,000 more a year is needed to meet operating deficits alone. Any expansion requires still more money—and there is no question that expansion is needed in the light of current war and civil defense requirements.

As a matter of fact, the need for the average school—again for 1 year's operational expenses alone—is \$516,000. Just \$16,000 more than the contribution of the AMA. And that for 1 school, not the 79 we have or the many more which are needed.

We plainly need Federal aid to medical education, and to dental, public health nursing, and other professional health training schools. This \$500,000 drop in the rain barrel should not obscure that basic and desperate need or the AMA's basically selfish motives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent all of next week because of reasons of health.

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

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. IRVING for all of next week.)

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON IN TEXAS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, throughout this year a number of the Members, I know, have noticed that I put in the Record numerous letters from farmers and county agricultural committees. I have had these letters analyzed by the Library of Congress and I am not altogether pleased to report these facts although I feel it my duty to do so. This, of course, does not cover the entire Cotton Belt because I did not get answers from all of the counties, but it does show, in my opinion, a trend of what is happening. I do not regard the trend to which I shall refer as a healthful one.

The analysis of the letters referred to shows the number of allotments of less than 5 acres was 22,145. The number of those who will grow no cotton was 4,453, or 20 percent of the cases referred to. That means this 20 percent of the people referred to will be out of the business of growing cotton. The number who were thrown out of the business of farming, referred to in the analysis, is 4 percent.

I have just one observation to make. If you should put 20 percent of the people who are in the grocery business out of the grocery business, naturally those people who are left, as long as we have good times, will be all right. If you put 20 percent of the people who are growing a given crop out of the business of growing it, naturally those who are left will do all right so long as times are good.

Is it the proper thing to legislate people out of business? I say "no." I am for free enterprise in farming just as I am in private business.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have tabulated the information on the number of farmers who received cotton acreage allotments of less than 5 acres which you requested in our recent telephone conversation and your note of September 26.

A summary of this information taken from the letters published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, July 31, September 22, and September 23 shows the following:

Number of allotments of less than 5 acres reported.....	22,145
Those who will grow no cotton:	
Number	4,453
Percent	20
Those who will quit farming:	
Number	878
Percent	4

I am returning the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and am enclosing the listing sheets as you may be interested in reviewing the individual items.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. WILCOX,
Senior Specialist, Agriculture, Legis-
lative Reference Service.

Name of letter writer	Number of allotments less than 5 acres	Percent will grow no cotton	Number will grow no cotton	Percent will quit farming own farm	Number will quit farming own farm
F. P. Martin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1950, p. 11147	170	95	162	0	0
R. J. Arnold, <i>ibid.</i>	76	5	4	0	0
T. Shelby Oakes, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 11148	272	5.5	15	0	0
Buel E. Wright, <i>ibid.</i>	266	50-60	146	20	53
Bert N. Brumfield, <i>ibid.</i>	154	10	15	(?)	(?)
Murphy J. Burch, <i>ibid.</i>	444	25	111	2	9
R. E. Hoffman, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 11148-11149	186	25	47	10	19
Ray S. McEntire, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 11149	60	75	45	0	0
F. W. Bolin and C. Riley Brown, <i>ibid.</i>	191	15	28	52	100
Woodrow W. Booth, <i>ibid.</i>	300	50	150	0	0
E. N. McCall, <i>ibid.</i>	478	52	250	5	24
S. C. Platt, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 11149-11150	226	10	22	11	25
A. H. Miller, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 11150	408	60	245	2	8
M. L. Bostick, <i>ibid.</i>	600	8	50	0	0
Fred J. Green, <i>ibid.</i>	43	58	25	0	0
Bernard H. Clark, <i>ibid.</i>	12	66	8	0	0
Fred K. Roberts, <i>ibid.</i>	540	19	100	5	25
T. W. Garriss, <i>ibid.</i>	267	9	25	0	0
G. R. Fulbright, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 11151	940	11	100	(?)	(?)
R. O. Fearrington, <i>ibid.</i>	857	25	214	(?)	(?)
Mallie Stott, <i>ibid.</i>	1,389	11	150	14	20
W. P. House, <i>ibid.</i>	1,151	13	150	(?)	(?)
F. W. Young, <i>ibid.</i>	253	50	129	0	0
T. G. Norris, <i>ibid.</i> , Sept. 22, 1950, p. 15610	628	11	70	0	0
Vernon L. Whittle, <i>ibid.</i>	345	22	75	58	200
Herman L. Hales, <i>ibid.</i>	943	5	47	2	19
C. Howard Treece, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 15610-15611	204	8	16	0	0
O. W. Barnett, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15611	202	10	20	(?)	(?)
J. D. Stephens, <i>ibid.</i>	288	5	15	4	12
Ray A. Waters, <i>ibid.</i>	84	20	17	5	4
Arthur R. Johnson, <i>ibid.</i>	367	25	92	0	0
Billy H. Reynolds, <i>ibid.</i>	30	67	20	17	5
Lealdon Smith, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 15611-15612	138	0	0	0	0
Max G. Sallings, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15612	100	1	1	2	2
William M. Belcher, <i>ibid.</i>	35	29	10	0	0
Carl E. Teeter (Maricopa County) also, for the State of Arizona, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 15612-15613 (letter to Hon. Murdock)	55	0	0	0	0
J. A. Sorenson, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15613	185	0	0	0	0
Robert E. Turner, <i>ibid.</i>	8	50	4	25	2
Emory Hunt, <i>ibid.</i>	282	18	50	0	0
Fred W. Barber, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 15613-15614	172	35	60	6	10
Clayton A. Burris, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15614	157	32	50	(?)	(?)
Roy F. Jones, <i>ibid.</i>	168	26	43	12	20
R. V. Richey, <i>ibid.</i>	38	66	25	13	5
John A. King, <i>ibid.</i>	84	30	25	(?)	(?)
Frank Wells, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15615	81	75	61	0	0
T. M. Minchew, <i>ibid.</i>	140	25	35	(?)	(?)
W. H. Huddleston, <i>ibid.</i>	393	25	100	0	0
Alex Long, <i>ibid.</i>	63	32	20	16	10
Joe B. Moran, <i>ibid.</i>	52	15	8	5	3
B. P. McWhirter, <i>ibid.</i>	75	20	15	5	4
<i>ibid.</i>	108	25	27	0	0

- 1 Approximate.
 2 Very small percentage.
 3 Very small number.
 4 Not given.
 5 Estimated.
 6 Slight.
 7 Very few.

Name of letter writer	Number of allotments less than 5 acres	Percent will grow no cotton	Number will grow no cotton	Percent will quit farming own farm	Number will quit farming own farm
John L. Binendine, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15616	76	10	8	0	0
Ranell Lowman, <i>ibid.</i>	51	50	26	10	5
Marion M. Shivers, <i>ibid.</i>	132	50	66	(?)	(?)
Q. D. Wilson, <i>ibid.</i>	473	5	25	0	0
Roy L. O'Brien, <i>ibid.</i>	114	22	25	13	15
E. D. Dixon, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15617	138	5	7	(?)	(?)
John L. Hays, <i>ibid.</i>	1	0	0	0	0
James B. Stewart, <i>ibid.</i>	18	0	0	0	0
Bert J. Ourso, <i>ibid.</i>	162	31	50	0	0
Hugh R. Eggerton, <i>ibid.</i>	32	97	31	0	0
John H. George, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15618	306	10-15	40	(?)	(?)
Waldo P. O'Neal, <i>ibid.</i>	56	26	25	0	0
Laura Mae Hammer, <i>ibid.</i>	4	100	4	25	1
Alvara B. Nance, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15619	18	44	8	17	3
Bill E. Fisher, <i>ibid.</i>	56	50	28	0	0
A. B. Duke, <i>ibid.</i>	154	25-30	43	(?)	(?)
U. Ozel Cox, <i>ibid.</i>	80	0	0	None	None
Gus Harris, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15620	670	7.5	50	3.7	25
Anonymous, <i>ibid.</i>	170	23.5	40	11.7	20
De Kalb County PMA Committee, <i>ibid.</i>	95	31.6	30	None	None
Jack Collins, <i>ibid.</i>	116	15	17	None	None
F. K. Wright, <i>ibid.</i>	34	21	7	None	None
Charles E. Kell, <i>ibid.</i>	16	10	2	10	2
G. B. Fowler, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15621	1,146	22	250	(?)	(?)
B. T. Lake, <i>ibid.</i>	350	5	18	5	18
F. W. Young, <i>ibid.</i>	258	50	129	0	0
W. W. Hankins, Jr., <i>ibid.</i>	12	0	0	0	0
Lucille A. Bass, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 15621-15622	15	0	0	0	0
W. P. House, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15622	1,151	13	150	(?)	(?)
George H. Carter, <i>ibid.</i> , Sept. 23, 1950, p. 15762	12	0	0	0	0
Cline T. Young, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15763	157	30	47	10	16
P. L. Barksdale, <i>ibid.</i>	192	8	15	0	0
Carl E. Lilly, <i>ibid.</i>	129	9	11	(?)	(?)
C. H. Teal, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15765	1	100	1	0	0
Alva E. Sanders, <i>ibid.</i>	264	19	50	38	100
Demp Kearney, <i>ibid.</i> , pp. 15765-15766	7	100	7	0	0
James M. Ratliff, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15766	56	35.7	20	0	0
A. J. Peters, <i>ibid.</i>	115	75	86	5	6
Bennett P. Haman, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15768	33	0	0	.5	0
H. R. Hill, <i>ibid.</i> , p. 15769	250	10	25	30-40	88
T. Shelby Oakes, <i>ibid.</i> , July 31, 1950, pp. 11428-11429	272	6	15	0	0
Summary: Number of allotments	22,145	20	4,453	4	878

- 4 Not given.
 5 Estimated.
 6 Small percentage.
 7 A few.

Source: Letters to Hon. Lindley Beckworth, Daily Congressional Record, July 26, 1951, Sept. 22, 23, 1950. Compiled by Warren W. Scott, Legislative Reference Service, Economics Section, Library of Congress, Oct. 3, 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
 Washington, November 21, 1950.
 HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
 House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This replies to your inquiry of November 6 with reference to changing price support legislation to require a farmer to carry out conservation practices in order to be eligible for Government price support.

In the statement of April 7, 1949, on the general farm program before a joint session of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees, one of the conditions recommended on an eligibility for price support was the observance of minimum and sound soil-conservation practices. It is recognized that such a requirement would present certain administrative difficulties and additional costs of administration, but it is believed that if the requirements are flexible to permit local adaptation to meet local conditions, such a requirement would advance the overall objectives of a sound farm program.

Further consideration should be given to the provision in future agricultural legislation.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. McCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
 Columbia, S. C., November 20, 1950.
 HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
 New House Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I thank you very much for sending me copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of September 22 and 23, 1950. You have certainly gone into the cotton allotment problem very thoroughly.

For your information I find conditions in South Carolina very much like you describe them in your State and we do hope something can be done to straighten out allotment messes when they are reimposed on the cotton farmers.

Very truly yours,

ROY JONES,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
 CITY OF KILGORE, TEX.,
 September 30, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
 House Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Enclosed is a photo copy of a cotton notice to Tommie N. Nixon, who resides near Kilgore, which is self explanatory.

I think it a shame and disgrace to penalize this man—or any other person of like status—for growing three bales of cotton on a little old worn-out east Texas farm, especially in the face of such a short cotton crop throughout the Nation this year, and with a big demand for cotton. We here in Kilgore can't buy sheets for our new hospital because of shortages of sheets on the market.

I have known Tommie for 30 years or more. During all these years he has been trying to eke out a living raising whatever crops and stock he could in order to live—not make money. He lives outside the oil field and has no income from that source. As I understand it, he didn't grow any cotton for perhaps 1 or 2 years and for that reason was refused a quota for this year.

In view of the fact there is every indication now there will be no restrictions on planting cotton in 1951; the short crop this year, and the high cost of living for these poor farmers, I see no reason why these restrictions can't be lifted now and give these people the relief so badly needed.

What can you do about it now?

Regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROY H. LAIRD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
 Washington, D. C., November 15, 1950.
 HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
 House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 30, 1950, with which you returned our letter to you, dated October 19, regarding overplanted cotton farms.

The statements made by "Roy" on the bottom of our letter have been observed and it is certainly true that there is need for additional cotton production as stated in the press release issued October 3, 1950, in connection with the announcement that acreage allotments and marketing quotas would not be in effect on the 1951 crop of cotton, a copy of which is enclosed. In general, the press release explains the need for at least a 16,000,000-bale crop of cotton next year.

You will observe that in the last paragraph of our letter of October 19, 1950, the condition under which marketing quotas could be terminated under the legislation was set forth.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. McCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 23, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 10, 1950, copies of which you addressed to Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, and Mr. Frank K. Woolley, Deputy Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, and with which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Roy H. Laird, Kilgore, Tex.

Cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1950 were established under the authority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This legislation provides that the farm marketing quota for cotton shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm less the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess is the normal production of that acreage planted to cotton on the farm which is in excess of the farm acreage allotment. If the overplanted acreage is not adjusted to the farm acreage allotment within a reasonable period, the farm marketing excess produced on the farm will be subject to penalty at a rate equal to 50 percent of the parity price for cotton as of June 15, or 15.5 cents per pound.

The farm marketing excess will in no case be larger than the normal yield per acre times the acreage planted in excess of the allotment. If the actual yield is less than the normal yield, and the producer establishes such fact to the satisfaction of the Production and Marketing Administration county committee, the farm marketing excess will be reduced to the amount by which the total production on the farm exceeds the normal yield times the allotment. In cases such as the one referred to in Mr. Laird's letter where no allotment is established for the farm, if the producer establishes, within 30 days after harvest is completed, that the actual production on the farm is less than the normal production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm, the producer may avoid the payment of a part of the penalty or may receive a refund of a portion of the penalty previously paid.

There is no authority in the legislation for waiving the acreage adjustment provision, except by suspension or termination of marketing quotas for the 1950 crop. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by the act to terminate or increase a national marketing quota when such action is found necessary to meet a national emergency or a material increase in export demand for the commodity. However, the large majority of cotton farmers who planted in excess of their farm allotments and who intended to adjust the planted acreage to their farm allotments have already made such adjustments. Others have paid a penalty on their excess acreage and have harvested or will harvest the cotton from this acreage. The termination of the national marketing quota for the 1950 crop of cotton, at this time, therefore,

would add no appreciable amount of cotton to the production of 1950. Consequently, it is our opinion that cotton-marketing quotas for the 1950 crop year should not be terminated.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE,
College Station, Tex., November 6, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your memorandum of October 28, I am returning the copy of correspondence from the Honorable K. T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, together with other attachments.

As outlined in my letter of October 3 and as restated in the letter of October 23 from the Assistant Secretary, it is felt that marketing quotas on the 1950 crop should not be suspended or terminated at this time. Mr. Nixon should arrange to meet with his local FMA county committee for the purpose of paying the marketing quota penalty described on Form MQ-93-Cotton.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

BIG SANDY, TEX., November 1, 1950.
Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: I am writing to explain the position I am in as a farmer. I have a farm leased in which there are 251 acres. This farm belongs to J. Press Davis. I moved on this farm in the fall of 1947. The place hadn't been farmed in several years. The following year I planted 20 acres of cotton, 10 acres of corn, and some small grain. My peanut allotment was zero. This year they allowed me 4.2 acres of cotton and no peanuts. I planted the cotton, knowing that I couldn't make much more than enough to pay my expenses and rent for the farm in which is \$175. I planted 12.4 acres of peanuts. When they came to measure my crop I told them that I planted those peanuts at my own risk, but they determined to measure them anyway.

On October 23, 1950, Mr. Lewis E. Stracener, administration officer, sent a man out to see me about my peanuts. He asked me if I had tried to sell them, or if I was going to sell them. I told him I was if I could. Then I went up to talk to Mr. Stracener. He told me there would be a penalty of 5.4 cents per pound, in which would be half or more than I would get out of the peanuts.

I am a veteran of World War II. I thought freedom was what we were fighting for, but when they allowed me 4.2 acres of cotton to make a living for my wife and two children I felt that my freedom was gone.

After returning from the service I borrowed money from the FHA to buy some cattle and a tractor in which I still owe some on this debt.

The point is if I can't plant but 4.2 acres of cotton I'll just have to quit and sell my cattle and tractor to get out of debt.

I believe since you being raised in east Texas, you know what I am up against, but I feel that there is some that don't.

That is about all I have to say except I would like very much to continue farming.

Yours very truly,

HOWARD M. SMITH.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 30, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letters of October 11, 1950, asking

whether the Department expects to recommend mandatory price support on the 1951 crop of sweetpotatoes.

Under the Agricultural Act of 1949 sweetpotatoes were placed in the same category as other vegetables with respect to purchase operations. Existing legislation appears adequate insofar as sweetpotatoes are concerned and unless circumstances change materially, the Department does not expect to recommend any change in legislation affecting sweetpotatoes.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. McCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Dallas, Tex., November 3, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I wish to keep you fully informed as to recent developments as applicable to the Farmers Home Administration program in your district. I am attaching your memoranda and letters from various individuals as you requested.

Last year, as you will recall, our agent went into various counties in that east Texas area with funds to assist farmers suffering a loss on their sweetpotato crops due to the heavy rainfall and flood conditions in 1949.

We held a meeting of all supervisory personnel in the east Texas area on October 31, about which I wrote you some few days ago. It appears that disaster conditions are prevalent in the area, especially with growers relying entirely on the one-cash-crop system of sweetpotatoes or cotton only.

In analyzing the situation and working out recommendations as an outgrowth of the Tyler meeting, I believe our agency can assist the area by developing a program under the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1951, making funds available for adjustments to assist these farmers in developing a sounder approach to their problems, by including livestock in their farm plans and in furnishing the finances necessary for an over-all farm program.

Our desire to recommend a program of this type to our Administrator is based on the fact, as you know, that our disaster program was set up last year in the area to assist the sweetpotato growers. From financial crop reports these loans are going to be one of loss to the Government; anyway, it appears they are headed in that direction now, as the growers are not able to market their potatoes and repay their loans under the prevailing conditions.

The statistical information necessary to enable us to present a formal request for the area to be declared a disaster area is being developed by our personnel. I plan to give Mr. Lasseter a full report on the entire area as soon as this information can be compiled and passed on to the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting that the area be designated under Public Law 38 and funds made available through the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1951.

Sincerely yours,

L. J. CAPPLEMAN,
State Director.

TYLER, TEX., November 3, 1950.
MR. DENNIS M. POE,
Purchase Representative, Production
and Marketing Administration, Pitts-
burg, Tex.

DEAR MR. POE: The harvesting of the East Texas sweet potato crop is far along and I believe that with clear weather 2 more weeks will see over 90 percent of the crop out of the ground. Some of the late plantings have been left as long as possible to increase size and weight.

Yields of No. 1 potatoes have been very disappointing. I doubt if the average would

amount to more than 50 to 60 boxes per acre. This explains why growers are not going the route of selling their crop for school-lunch purposes. The actual cost to them will run at least \$75 per acre and at \$1.35 per box, they could not afford to lose some \$25 per acre. Most of them tell me that they had rather go ahead and gamble on a rising price in future months. The market will no doubt react and we are encouraging farm storage by everyone who has any volume of potatoes.

I was hoping that a price of at least \$1.75 could be set up to assist the growers during the low-priced period which would have held the market at somewhere near that level. The small farmer with a 5- to 10-acre patch of potatoes has had to sell them at considerable loss in order to get the crop out of ground before frost. It is this type of farmer that surplus programs are designed to aid. Of course, you and I do not have any control over the setting of the price which is offered to farmers, but if it had been set at a reasonable figure we would not have had the losses to the farmers which have occurred this season.

We appreciate your fine cooperation which you and your coworkers have given and if we can help you in any way, let us know.

Yours truly,

J. F. ROSBOROUGH,
Horticultural Marketing Specialist.
Copy to Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., November 7, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: You will find enclosed copy of final report of Sweetpotato Program RMP-25a-74, which was terminated November 3. You will note that only 500 bushels of potatoes were purchased.

I am also enclosing copy of a letter to Mr. J. L. Harris, route 1, Gladewater, Tex., and one to Mr. N. E. Dudley, of Whitehouse, Smith County, Tex., giving them information we have regarding shipments of sweetpotatoes from quarantined areas.

I want you to know that I appreciated the visit with you and it is regretted that we were not able to help the farmers in your area. In summing up the potato situation up there this year and with the interest of the farmer at heart, you cannot blame the farmer for not selling his potatoes to the Government at a price we offered, as most of the farmers were only getting 25 to 40 percent U. S. No. 1 potatoes off of their land and the actual cost to them runs at least \$75 per acre and the farmers felt that they had rather hold, taking a chance on a better market instead of taking a \$25-per-acre loss on their potatoes.

The market is stronger and has improved some. I think the cooperative advertising has helped some. Assuring you of our cooperation, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

DENNIS M. POE,
Purchase Representative.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Gilmer, Tex., October 16, 1950.

To: Hon. Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH.
From: Upshur County PMA Committee.

Subject: Provisions be changed in acreage allotment law to give veterans a better break in getting future acreage allotment for farms that have no previous acreage history.

For instance: All veterans of World Wars I and II and subsequent wars that buy or rent farms that have no cropland history in the base years from which farm allotments are computed, by making application to the County Committee shall be granted crop acreage that compares favorably with other farms in the vicinity.

Then their acreage for allotment crops shall be computed according to the acreage granted by the County Committee.

If you remember, the industrial workers were guaranteed their jobs back if and when they returned home. All kinds of promises were made the other boys but no provision was made in the law for their benefit on crop acreage allotments on farms with no crop history.

The veterans that come within this category that made application for allotments received on an average about 1.5 acres, some as low as 0.2 of an acre. This was so small that some of them would not plant.

W. B. HOLLINSHEAD,
R. L. WHITT,
E. C. PALMER,
Upshur County PMA Committee.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of
October 17, 1950]

POLITICAL CONTROL CRIPPLES COTTON

Senator TOM CONNALLY says that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan's restriction of cotton exports favors the spinning industry to the disadvantage of the farmers. This is the truth, but not the whole truth. The whole Government program of controls also favors the foreign cotton growers and the producers of both natural and synthetic competing fabrics, to the disadvantage of the cotton farmers.

Looking at the record of cotton crop control to date, we find the following results indisputable:

First, it has given the farmer a momentarily higher price but robbed him of most of the benefits of it by inflating the purchasing power of the dollar through similar moves favoring other minority groups.

Second, it has increasingly encouraged all manner of competition with cotton in such a way that more and more artificial stimulus must be injected into the cotton growing industry in order to maintain even a semblance of higher value. For example, Texas cotton normally sells on a parity with, or a little above, Mexican cotton. Since the recent order of the Department of Agriculture, Texas cotton has dropped \$20 a bale and Mexican cotton has increased \$40. The same boost in price of foreign cotton has been general. The American taxpayer—and the American cotton farmer—are paying through the nose to encourage foreign production of cotton.

Third, it is largely offsetting the good results being obtained in cotton growing, marketing and spinning research such as is being carried on by the Texas Cotton research committee.

The present crisis in the southern cotton industry comes from official blundering almost without parallel. And the blundering has been done primarily by people in authority who know little about the cotton industry.

It appears that the cotton industry of the South is headed for extinction, despite some sound economic and scientific achievements to preserve it, unless something is done to reverse the trend of political control.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., November 14, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter dated October 19, 1950, copies of which were forwarded to Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, and Mr. Frank K.

Woolley, Deputy Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from the Upshur County, Texas PMA Committee. This county committee has recommended that the acreage-allotment law be amended to provide certain privileges for veterans of World Wars I and II.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, under which the 1950 national cotton acreage allotment was apportioned to the respective States, counties and farms is specific as to the manner in which the apportionments shall be made. The act contains no provisions which would permit special consideration for veterans, as individuals, in the establishment of cotton acreage allotments.

Since marketing quotas and acreage allotments will not be in effect on the 1951 crop of cotton, veterans who are operating farms which do not have cotton acreage history for the other base period years will have an opportunity to establish cotton acreage history for 1951.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

[From the Farmer-Stockman of November
1950]

TALKS WITH OUR READERS

(By Ferdie J. Deering, editor)

The futility of Government attempts to control crop production through acreage allotments is demonstrated again in the 1950 cotton-crop failure. So, for 1951 at least, there won't be any acreage controls on the cotton crop.

The breakdown of the allotment system might be glossed over by designating last spring's "cotton surplus" as a "national reserve" this fall. But that won't keep farmers from regarding last spring's red tape in the form of red ink this fall. What does it matter if cotton sells for 40 cents a pound if you lost your crop to bugs, bad weather, and bureaucrats?

Farmers planted only about 18,000,000 of the 21,000,000 acres allotted this year, in spite of clamor for larger allotments in some areas. Texas in 1949 grew about one-third of the Nation's cotton, so drew a big cut in acreage this year. But farmers planted 8 percent less than allotted. Oklahoma, with a small allotment, failed by about 19 percent to get it all planted.

A survey by Texas Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH revealed that one reason was that, all over the cotton belt, thousands of farmers received less than 5 acres cotton acreage allotment. Many of these planted no cotton.

In Oklahoma, 384 of LeFlore County's 2,097 cotton growers had less than 5 acres. In Stephens County 305 had 5 acres or less, in Atoka County 659 growers were assigned less than 5 acres. In Carter County, where Ardmore was once a major inland cotton market, 154 of the 735 old cotton growers had under 5 acres. The list could be extended in Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas, or Mississippi.

The allotments didn't cause the main reduction in cotton yields, though. Bad weather in many areas, and heavy insect damage in most sections cut yields so that farmers grew only about 10,000,000 bales of cotton, much less than our usual needs. Most of the 1948 and 1949 loan cotton has moved into trade. We need a cotton crop in 1951 to avoid a cotton shortage. Until Government can control the weather, it can't control crop production.

Commentators have a lot to say about Government losses on price-support programs. Some of it is true. Part may be easily misinterpreted.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, supported by big business, has made a study

in which it points out that only one manufacturing company apparently has greater assets than the \$3,250,000,000 held by the Commodity Credit Corp. Standard Oil of New Jersey is larger. General Motors and United States Steel are smaller. Agriculture is big, and with \$100,000,000 in capital and \$6,750,000,000 in borrowing power, CCC is a major factor in all aspects of our national economy.

The report also points out that not all CCC programs show losses. It cites 4 years with profits totaling \$138,000,000 paid to Federal Treasury. From 1933 to 1950 the domestic cotton program shows a profit of \$245,000,000 the cotton-rubber barter program carried on during the war netted \$11,000,000 and the domestic tobacco program shows a profit of over \$5,000,000.

On the loss side are the \$416,000,000 for potatoes, \$92,000,000 on wool, \$82,000,000 on eggs, \$67,000,000 on peanuts, and \$51,000,000 on wheat.

The net loss on price-support programs since its organization in 1933 is reported to be \$646,000,000, according to the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Some people want the national farm program to fail, so they make a lot about these losses. A good price-support program should just about break even, over a period of years. If it loses consistently it becomes a subsidy. Neither farmers nor taxpayers are pleased with that kind of dole system.

Some farmers have been disappointed because their hybrid corn didn't turn out the big yields they'd read about. Trouble usually is that they planted the corn on poor land, expecting miracles from the seed. But even hybrid seed has to have something to grow on if it's to make a crop. One noted corn breeder told me last summer, "You can do more to increase corn yields by building up your soil fertility than you can by switching to hybrid seed. But once you've built up your soil, then plant hybrid seed and stand back for a big harvest."

Are Federal orders regulating milk marketing in metropolitan milksheds a good thing, or not? Some producers are seriously debating their value. The trouble is, in the Oklahoma City milkshed especially, that they already have the order, and they are finding it is much easier to get under a Federal control than to get rid of it.

In the Oklahoma City area the price paid to producers under the order has been less than it was before the order. The price to consumers has been increased. The base has been broadened so that producers may market more of their milk over the flush season, and accurate weights and tests are assured.

A similar order is in effect in Tulsa. The Dallas-Forth Worth area has the matter under consideration. Houston survived a milk war without an order, and now producers there receive one of the Nation's top prices. Which is best we cannot say. We do believe that producers should look at the situation carefully before vesting marketing rights in a Federal bureau. The time to consider is before the action is applied; it isn't easy to change things afterward.

Every now and then we get a complaint from some shipper who thinks his stock has been mixed up in selling. We've never found a case where there was substantial evidence that this happened.

However, it could happen, because a lot of people never brand or mark their animals before shipping. They only know that they sent a red steer and a black cow to market. The yards receive daily scores of head that would meet that general description.

Don't spoil the hide by too large markings, but help defeat rustlers at home and avoid mistakes in shipping by using some clear marking that will identify your stock to your neighbors, the trucker, and the commission man who sells them for you.

You can have your brand registered for your exclusive use if you wish, affording greater protection against the thieves that are working our ranches these days.

ELKHART FARMERS COOPERATIVE
ASSOCIATION,
Elkhart, Tex., November 20, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: More than 70 members of the association recently voted unanimously to oppose any reduction in the peanut acreage allotment in a special meeting held in the Elkhart auditorium.

I am instructed by unanimous resolution to ask your support in the matter of using your influence to stop this reduction in acreage over 1950 allotment.

Yours very truly,
M. V. STUTEVILLE, Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., December 1, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of November 28, in which you quoted a letter received from Mr. M. V. Stuteville, Elkhart Farmers Cooperative Association, Elkhart, Tex.

I regret that there is nothing this organization can do about the reduction of peanut acreage allotment since the law as passed by Congress specifies the method to be used by the Department in allocating peanut acreage allotments. The reduction in Texas is very severe and is going to work an extreme hardship on many producers.

Very truly yours,
B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

WALLER, TEX., December 1, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Enclosed is a letter from a broker in Canada, whom Mr. King, of the King Peanut Co., Abilene, Tex., contacted in regard to my peanuts.

From this letter you will see where our agriculture market is going.

Please return to Mr. King after you have digested the contents.

Thanking you for your efforts in my behalf,
Yours very truly,

A. WM. SCHILD.

W. H. ESCOTT CO., LTD.,
Winnipeg, Canada, November 17, 1950.
KING PEANUT CO.,
Abilene, Tex.

DEAR SIR: We thank you for your favor of the 14th instant quoting us on Spanish peanuts. However, we are sorry that the prospects are not very favorable for business with Canada at this time due to the fact that similar commodities are obtainable from China, India, at prices anywhere from 5 to 7 cents per pound below the basis you quote. We, however, doubt whether you can meet this competition in view of your Government price guarantee. However, should circumstances enable you to give us lower prices, we would be very pleased to hear from you.

Yours very truly,
W. H. ESCOTT CO., LTD.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN McDUFFIE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, I was across the water under an assignment from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I have only recently returned and today have just been apprised that the attention of the Members of the House has not been called to the fact that on that day a former distinguished Member of this House fell asleep, at the end of a service of 15 years as judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama, who served for 20 years theretofore as an honored and beloved Member of this House, the Honorable John McDuffie of Monroeville and Mobile, Ala.

Judge McDuffie was born at River Ridge in Monroe County, Ala., on September 25, 1883, the son of John and Virginia Marion Lett McDuffie. He was educated by private tutors and in the Southern University at Greensboro, Ala., then graduated from the Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn, in 1904, graduated from the University of Alabama Law School with a degree of LL. B. in 1908.

His first public service was in the legislature of Alabama where his service commended him to the electorate of Alabama, who elected him prosecuting attorney for the first judicial circuit of Alabama for two terms, and then sent him to Congress, where he was a member of the House of Representatives from the Sixty-sixth to the Seventy-fourth Congresses, representing the First Alabama District.

He resigned March 2, 1935, to become judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama.

He was the author of much important legislation, including the McDuffie-Tydings Act, which decreed freedom for the Philippines.

He came within three votes of being elected speaker of the National House of Representatives.

He was a member of the Democratic Party, the Presbyterian Church of the United States, the Masonic, and Knights of Pythias. He was married twice, his first wife being Mrs. Cornelia H. McDuffie. Of that union there was born one child, a daughter, Cornelia, who is now Mrs. Turner. He is survived by his second wife, Mrs. Mary C. McDuffie.

He was known and beloved by many Members of this House and by everyone who ever served with him. It is not too much to say that he was as popular as any man who ever graced these Halls.

Judge McDuffie rendered a memorable service to the bench as well as to the bar, and the administration of justice, not only in Alabama but here in Washington and in many other places where he had been called by his duties.

It gives me pride to certify that this truly great man rendered his State and the Nation a service that few have equaled and none excelled.

Every heart must go out to his bereaved loved ones.

It is a sad duty to apprise the House of his passing onto the reward which he so richly earned and deserves, in the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I simply wish to endorse everything the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has said about our distinguished friend and former colleague, John McDuffie.

I served with him here for many years. We were intimately acquainted. In one contest we were pitted against each other. I can truthfully say that I never met a finer American, a more courteous gentleman, or a nobler character than John McDuffie.

His passing is a great loss, not only to the State of Alabama, but to the entire Nation.

Mr. HOBBS. I now yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. John McDuffie lived a great and useful life. His was a good and great soul. He was a friend to man. He truly served his day and generation.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Alabama best expressed our late friend and colleague when he said that he was known and loved by many Members as anyone who ever served in this body. When I first came to this body in 1928, John McDuffie was one of the first Members that I met, and there developed a very close and strong friendship between us. Those of us who served with John McDuffie will always remember him not only as a legislator but as a man. He was always a gentleman; kind, considerate, and charitable. As a legislator he was outstanding. The respect and confidence that his colleagues had in him is evidenced by the fact that he was Democratic whip for several years. He was at one time a candidate for Speaker. He was defeated only in a very close vote, and as one of our colleagues sitting close by observed just a few moments ago to me and a few of us who were seated near him it was one of the hardest-fought contests for Speakership ever waged. John McDuffie rendered outstanding service to his State, and when he came to the Congress, outstanding service to his country in the legislative walk of life and, later, in the judicial branch of our Government, for many years, he rendered equally outstanding service. I am deeply grieved in the passing of John McDuffie. When his death was announced I sent a telegram to his widow conveying to her and the other loved ones left behind the deep sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself, which I reiterate and repeat on this occasion.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as one who served in the House with the late Judge and Representative John McDuffie, I would like to join in paying tribute to his memory and to his services as a Member of the House and district judge of the United States Court for the District of Alabama in which Mobile is located.

Judge McDuffie served in the House of Representatives for eight terms, or 16 years, from March 4, 1919, to March 2, 1935, when he resigned to accept an appointment as United States district judge.

When I became a Member of the House on March 4, 1925, John McDuffie was among the first Members of Congress that I met. Our families lived in the same hotel for a number of years. He was a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and supported the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country. The improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries was vital to the people of the district I represent. We thus had many interests in common.

John McDuffie was an able and capable legislator. He was familiar with the science of government. He was a man possessed of wide information and was familiar with the problems and issues of all parts of our common country. He had his political convictions. He was not only a very capable legislator but he was a courageous statesman.

He possessed the judicial temperament. While I am more familiar with his record as a legislator than as a judge, he occasionally presided over the district Federal courts in Mississippi and he enjoyed the esteem of the members of the bar for his fairness and ability in the conduct of the court.

John McDuffie was a great patriot. He was devoted to his country. He was a kind husband and father. He had a most successful career in the House of Representatives and on the bench of the district court of the United States. Honor to his memory and peace to his ashes.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I would be delighted to yield to the distinguished lady.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much the richer for having known and having served in the Congress with my former colleague, Judge McDuffie. I can say that there were no party lines as far as he was concerned, and that he was beloved and respected by the Republicans as well as by his colleagues of his own party. Among his outstanding characteristics I remember his humor, his ability, and his courage.

With his wife and all his friends, I mourn the passing of a great man, a great judge, a great statesman, and a great patriot.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I join with the gentleman from Alabama in his splendid tribute to a man who

was a brilliant and outstanding American. It was my privilege to know John McDuffie for many years when he served as a Member of the House. I was pleased to enjoy his fine southern hospitality in his home in Mobile, Ala. John McDuffie was of the scholar-in-politics type. He served for the purpose of making his country a better place in which to live. He believed the closer the Government was to the people, the better it was for all. He vigorously opposed the trend of an all-powerful bureaucracy. In his later life he was an able jurist and served with great distinction.

The world is much poorer for his passing at this time. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family in this, their hour of bereavement.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to yield to the very distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I want to join with the gentleman and the other Members of the House in paying a last tribute to John McDuffie. I was here in Congress with him for many years. He was my friend and I was his friend. I heartily supported him for Speaker of the House. I was very sorry that he was defeated. However, he was defeated by one who was also a great man.

John McDuffie was one of the most useful Members of this House I ever served with. He loved his fellow man. He served his country with zeal and earnestness.

Along with the gentleman from Alabama and the other Members of this Congress I want to pay tribute to John McDuffie, and we are sorry he is gone. We who served with him will never forget him or the fine service he rendered this country.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman so much.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life and services of the late Honorable John McDuffie.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I did not know of the passing of our former colleague, Judge John McDuffie, until the matter was brought to the attention of the House, a few minutes ago, by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. Certainly, I want to join with the others in paying my tribute to the life and character of Judge McDuffie.

When Mr. McDuffie was in the House I knew him well. We lived at the same hotel and our families were most friendly. We all regretted when Mr. McDuffie left us. When men like John McDuffie retire from Congress there is an unexplainable void. Things just do not seem the same for a time. His friends were numbered by his acquaintances and he accomplished much in the Congress for his district, his State and his Nation. He became United States judge in Alabama and I continued as a

member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives having jurisdiction over Federal courts. Because of this fact, our friendly relations and mutual interests brought us together occasionally and prompted much correspondence between us. We usually agreed on judicial matters and I always prized his information and suggestions. He had a fine legal mind, was a tireless worker and was intellectually honest. In short, he had the courage of his convictions and the court reports stand as a monument to his sound judgment and his fearlessness. My family joins me in expressing sympathy and sorrow to his bereaved family.

SUGGESTIONS: TRUCE IN KOREA; ABOLISH SECURITY COUNCIL; LET NATIONS APPLY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, we are all tremendously concerned with the Korean crisis and its meaning for the future of the world. This morning, as one suggestion for a course of action, I sent the following telegram to the President of the United States:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 8, 1950.
President HARRY S. TRUMAN,

The White House:

Respectfully suggest following as possible basis for easing Korean crisis:

First. Mutual cease fire orders and withdrawal of United Nations and Chinese troops from North Korea.

Second. United Nations to set up interim seven man commission to supervise rehabilitation and administration of all Korea, selected from nations not represented by troops in current fighting.

Third. Elections September 1, 1951 for constituent assembly and provisional government to take office October 1, 1951 and make provisions for a permanent government for Republic of United Korea.

Fourth. United Nations to withdraw troops from South Korea and fleet from Formosa waters not later than October 15, 1951.

Fifth. United Nations interim commission to report progress periodically and to withdraw from Korea by December 31, 1951.

Sixth. Change United Nations Charter to abolish Security Council and provide that any member nation may exempt itself from application of Assembly actions involving its sovereignty by filing an exception within 30 days.

Seventh. Make question of admitting new states to United Nations General Assembly the first order of business following the organization of each annual session and provide for a standing committee to receive applications from any government and to report with recommendations at the opening of each annual session next following receipt of such application.

FRANCIS CASE,
Member of Congress.

THE EUROPEAN ASIATIC SITUATION

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in all the speculation regarding what is happening in the conferences going on between Prime Minister Attlee and President Truman, it has been frequently reported or suggested that some of the European

countries favor our reducing our own efforts in the Far East and our assistance to those who are resisting armed communism in Asia, there seems to be a belief that less aid to Asia will mean more aid to Europe; and that even to let Asia go will improve the prospects of saving Europe. I think our friends in Europe ought to understand that any such belief has a very dubious basis. It is more likely that less aid to Asia will mean less aid to Europe also. Why? Because the loss of Asia to Communist control, thereby freeing Russia to send into Europe all of her own forces and a few million Chinese, too, if needed, will so reduce the prospects of being able to save Europe that it is very doubtful whether the United States would be justified in continuing aid to Europe. To weaken ourselves further without saving them is of no benefit to them any more than to our own country.

I say this as one who has supported fully every program of aid to Europe, and who will continue to do so just as long as there is any reasonable possibility of success. But you have heard me express repeatedly during more than 3 years my conviction that our best chances of preventing war with Russia is to keep both Western Europe and China free and capable of resistance so that the Soviets are compelled to divide their strength and attention between two widely separated fronts. We still must find means to prevent her concentrating all of her forces against Europe or there will be no chance of its successful defense. I am convinced as much as ever that to save either Europe, or Asia, both must be kept independent of Soviet control. The loss of either will mean the loss of both. If Western Europe does not help us to the full in Asia, it is not reasonable to expect that we will consider it wise or possible to increase or even to continue our help to them in Europe. I hope that is clearly understood by all in our Government as well in the European countries.

RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the rent-control bill may have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR TO BE CALLED THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next it may be in order to call the bills on the Private Calendar.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader tell us what we may expect next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. On Monday we will continue consideration of the air-mail-separation bill.

On Tuesday the Yugoslav bill. A rule has been reported out granting 3 hours of general debate. Only general debate will be had on Tuesday, and the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

I am informed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the appropriation bill will probably be ready to be taken up the latter part of next week.

There is also the civilian defense program. I am unable to give anything approaching definiteness on that, except that one member of the committee told me that it probably would not be ready at the earliest before the latter part of next week. However, the other two bills are definite. It is quite definite that the appropriation bill will be in order the latter part of next week. Conference reports may be in order any time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

BENEFITS TO VETERANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] who, on every pos-

sible occasion advocates consideration for our veterans, as do we all, had something to say, and I commend his remarks to your attention and hope you will read them as printed in the RECORD. He referred to a certain benefit which it is proposed be given to the veterans.

We can all go along with this program of giving every benefit possible to the veterans, but I am wondering if the veterans, their wives and relatives would not appreciate it more if, before they become veterans, we give consideration to and adopt a policy which would avoid the necessity of their becoming veterans and fighting here, there, all over the world. Would they not like it much better if they had an opportunity to stay at home, get married, raise a family, educate their children, and provide for their own old age rather than to receive any benefit which the Congress or a grateful country can extend to them later as veterans?

If my understanding of our Chaplain's prayer this morning is correct, he suggested that more important than the relationship of the nations of the world to each other was the relationship of each nation, and presumably our Nation was included, to God. I will agree with him on that, we have drifted far away from the Scriptures and from the sound principles of our forefathers. But unfortunately all nations do not seem to have, or at least they do not recognize, the same God. We have one. Other nations have others. At least I think they have—no, I will take that back. I will not say I think they have. Some folks think they have. I have an idea that perhaps we are all trying to worship the same Divine Being.

I never did fall for the doctrine that if a Chinese died he was going to hell just because he did not belong to the Lutheran Church. I have sometimes thought, in fact I have always thought, that even the Methodists, whose ministers used to preach hell fire and damnation, and to which church my mother used to send me or even go with me when as a youngster when I slipped a little and did something I should not, would get to heaven just as easily, just as quickly, as any of the rest of us. She would send me there or go with me sometimes, and I was forced to listen to that minister preach. That minister would scare the everlasting daylights out of me for a week or two, and I would be a fairly decent boy.

I do not think that all these nations are going to the bad place, even if they do not worship, by name at least, the same Divinity that we do.

Permit me to express my humble judgment—and I speak in all humility.

THE INTERNATIONALISTS' FOLLY, PLUS TRUMAN'S STUBBORNESS, ENDANGERS THE REPUBLIC

American internationalists have refused to recognize any limitation of the kindly precept that every man is his brother's keeper. If such a policy was universally accepted and acted upon, the world's troubles might be over. But, acted upon by only a fraction of the people, such a policy is futile.

The internationalists believe, or pretend to believe, that it is the duty of the

American people to aid and sustain all those whoever, wherever, they may be, who have less of anything deemed desirable.

The internationalists have not only attempted to commit us to the program of reestablishing the economic life, of rehabilitating the people, not only of the countries injured by World War II, but also of modernizing in every respect areas which were not affected by that war.

Yes, the internationalists go even further and insist that, where other people, other nations, do not ask for or do not want our aid, we should, by force of arms if need be, mold them to our way of thinking and life. Our internationalists are insisting that a world police force be used to compel acceptance of our policies.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is stated that that will be accomplished through the point 4 program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I would say to the gentleman from Minnesota that before they ever thought of point 4 they had another way of doing it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Quite a number of things that arise in these international affairs are rather puzzling. Secretary Acheson, I believe, served notice on the Koreans that if they did not balance their budget we could not help them any more; he also served notice on Greece that unless they balanced their budget they could not get aid from this country. What about balancing the budget of our own country instead of chiding them because they have not balanced their budget?

Another thing, the gentleman will recall that they were making plans to spend \$10,000,000,000 to rehabilitate Korea when the war was over. I do not know how much more they expect it will cost for rehabilitation or how many other countries they anticipate having to take over.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from New York.

There has never been any thought of balancing our own budget. The chaplain, I think, almost every day asks the good Lord to help us. Apparently altogether too many are relying upon the thought that the Lord is going to balance the budget, because certainly the Congress does not make any effort to do it. So I suggest that we Members not only seek the assistance of the Lord in our prayers in balancing the budget, and in saving the country from its foolishness, but after praying it might also be well to have the prayers written up and then bring them down to the House with us the next day and look at them before we vote and do a little something to help the Lord accomplish the task we have delegated to him.

Now, coming back to point 4, before they ever thought of point 4, the internationalists had the idea that if any of these nations did not want what we were attempting to give them or force

on them we should just join up in a world police force and make them take it, force it on them. I do not think that can be done.

The internationalists, for the last 10 or more years, have had their way. Financially, politically, powerful and arrogant, with false charges of a lack of patriotism against all who oppose their program, they have intimidated the overwhelming number of our people and their representatives, who long have realized that it is impossible for 150,000,000 people to impose their will upon the rest of the world.

The internationalists learned little, if anything, from World War I or World War II. Stubbornly refusing to either count the cost or evaluate the prospect of success, the internationalists have involved us in world war III.

The administration and specifically Mr. Truman, through Dean Acheson, who never apparently has considered first the welfare of America, and those of his school of thought, while pretending to fight communism, have coddled, harbored, and encouraged Communists and near-Communists in strategic positions in the Federal Government.

We are in world war III. Mr. Truman and his State Department set the stage for that war.

July 19, 1950, the President sent a message to Congress, in which, among other things, he stated that, on the morning of June 25, the North Koreans invaded the Republic of Korea.

He further told Congress that—

In response to urgent appeals from the Government of Korea, General MacArthur was immediately authorized to send supplies of ammunition to the Korean defenders. * * * The United States Seventh Fleet was ordered north from the Philippines, so that it might be available in the area in case of need.

In the afternoon, the Security Council of the United Nations met at the request of Mr. Truman, who assumed to speak for the United States. At that meeting, the Security Council passed a resolution which called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the withdrawal, to the thirty-eighth parallel, of the North Korean invading troops.

The President further said that—

Throughout Monday, June 26, the invaders continued their attack with no heed to the resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations. Accordingly, in order to support the resolution, and on the unanimous advice of our civil and military authorities, I ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

On Tuesday, June 27, when the United Nations Commission in Korea had reported that the northern troops had neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn to the thirty-eighth parallel, the United Nations Security Council met again and passed a second resolution recommending that members of the United Nations furnish to the Republic of Korea such aid as might be necessary to repel the attack and to restore international peace and security in the area.

Forthwith Mr. Truman, at the request of the Security Council, without the consent of the Congress, which alone has power to declare war, put us into world war III.

World war III, staged by Mr. Truman and his State Department, has already cost the lives of more than 10,000 American men. No one today knows even approximately the number of casualties. Their foreign policy has given us, next to Pearl Harbor, the greatest military defeat in our history.

Unless their program is repudiated, it may give us the greatest casualties sustained in all other wars in which our country has engaged. It may ultimately destroy our ability to defend ourselves.

But one thing we do know—one thing even the most ardent internationalist should know—is that England does not propose to go all out in a war against either Russia or the Chinese Communists. Did you note the statement of Prime Minister Attlee the other day? He said that the British flag would be found flying beside our flag in Korea. But he did not say that the British flag or the British troops would follow the Stars and Stripes, our Armed Forces, into Manchuria. The omission was significant.

France seems to have no will to join us in a world war. Her support, even in Western Europe, does not appear to be wholehearted.

We know, too—at least those of us who are willing to accept realities—that neither England nor France has any enthusiasm for a war in Western Europe.

Every thinking man also knows that the United States alone cannot engage in war throughout the world and win.

Those who have advocated the surrender of a portion of our sovereignty, insisted that we become a part of United Nations, a member of the North Atlantic Pact, will admit that it is Stalin's policy to induce us to dissipate our strength, our resources, by fighting a war wherever he can induce his satellites to start war. If we drop into that dead-fall, we may be bled white, our strength dissipated, the ability to defend the Republic destroyed.

The foregoing being the situation, it being evident that our so-called allies intend, at all times and in every way, to protect and advance their own national interests, whatever may be the harmful result to us, we should without delay, as quickly as can be done, get out of Korea—of Manchuria.

To withdraw from Korea may be humiliating, but never was there a war in which the victor was not at some time during the conflict forced to shorten and consolidate his battle line. Better to suffer humiliation now than to attempt to hold an untenable position at the risk of losing a war—destroying the Republic.

And unless the British and the French drastically change their policy, we should get out of Western Europe. We should get our men home and do as every other nation throughout the world is attempting to do—build up our national defense, make ourselves secure in the homeland.

An editorial, recently published by the Hearst papers, expresses to some extent the thought I have in mind and which has been repeatedly emphasized in letters from my constituents. It is as follows:

OUR AMERICAN DUTY

The blundering and disloyal foreign policies of the New Deal are taking this country into complete disaster—both military and economic.

Our sovereignty has been impaired by making us a virtual vassal of the United Nations, which disrupts our councils, and seeks to fly its mongrel flag over our public buildings.

Our wealth is dissipated to support socialism abroad and to defend alien peoples who are not willing to defend themselves.

The lives of our young men are being sacrificed in a desperate war which our purported allies are not trying to help us win on the battlefields and are conspiring to make us lose in the mazes of diplomacy—and duplicity.

For our own survival, it is imperative that we extricate ourselves from these destroying situations at once.

Without even inadequate support from others in the United Nations, we are fighting almost alone against massed hordes on the Asian continent.

Continuing the war means only the slaughter of millions in a quixotic American attempt to conquer a vast and distant population.

First and foremost, therefore, this country should withdraw its armed forces from the invasion areas.

We should get our troops out of Korea as quickly as possible.

We should come home to our own country, reconstruct our defenses, and give heed to our own security and welfare.

This might be a defeat for the New Deal, which is responsible for our dismal plight.

It would not be a defeat for the United States, but merely an act of self-preservation. Secondly, we should get out of the United Nations.

That organization has not sustained us in the war that we undertook in its behalf.

Instead, it has interfered with our operations.

Furthermore, it is conniving to admit the enemy into a privileged membership where the enemy could dictate peace terms.

Accordingly, the United Nations should let Red China in—and leave the United States out.

Then let the United Nations see how it gets along.

This country has maintained the United Nations since its inception, with no return in loyalty or gratitude.

So let those who run the United Nations pay for the United Nations—and fight its wars.

Finally, we should end our unrequited efforts to support and supply an ingrate Europe.

Even England, our supposedly staunch ally, has not genuinely backed us in our solitary United Nations war, nor assisted us elsewhere.

On the contrary, Marxist England formally recognized the Chinese Communist government, and collaborates with Marxist France in preventing an European rearmament.

Europe has intimated it no longer wants our martial help.

This is Europe's attitude. Let Europe look out for itself, and see how Europe gets along.

Since, obviously, we stand alone, we should have the wisdom and the courage to act alone.

For our duty is to protect our own people and to foster our own nation.

EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 878, Rept. No. 3181), which was referred to the

House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9853) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

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

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include an editorial and a resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by the president of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement on foreign policy.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution from the Grange.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include appropriate material.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

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

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith the full text of the announcement of the American Medical Association on the contribution it is making to the medical schools.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 483. An act to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; and

H. R. 2365. An act for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1772. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$861,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1773. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the thirty-second annual national convention of the American Legion, held at Los Angeles, Calif., October 9, 10, 11, and 12, 1950, pursuant to Public Law No. 249, Seventy-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 734); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 3180. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 878. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9853, a bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia; without amendment (Rept. No. 3181). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. Senate Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period cer-

tain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 3182). Ordered to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 9888. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 9889. A bill for the relief of Ivan Norman Genit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 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:

O Thou God of our salvation, the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee: Lest we lost our footing and our way in all the terror and tragedy of these testing days, we turn from the din of earth's shouting and tumult to this noontide altar of Thy grace. Through the tangled wilderness of human relations, show us the clear path of Thy will for our troubled day. In the dense darkness, black as the pit from pole to pole, be to us as a pillar of cloud and of fire. In the confusion of tongues and councils, endue us with the wisdom to rightly discern the signs of the times. This day, keep our tongues from evil and our lips from speaking guile, so that no careless word of ours may smite or hurt the spirit of another by our side. So may we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee, our God. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 8, 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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is equally divided after a quorum call, and the unanimous-consent agreement seems to contemplate a mandatory quorum call.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HILL. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, some business has already been transacted before we have had a quorum call. I therefore ask that the time thus consumed be charged equally to both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time does not begin to run until after a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. In that case I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the acting majority leader. What will happen in the event the motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is agreed to? Is it the intention of the Senators who are in charge of the bill to press for an immediate vote on the bill, or will the bill be open to further amendment?

Mr. HILL. Under the rules of the Senate, the bill would be open to further amendment. However, it is our intention to try to get a vote on the bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe it would clarify the situation if immediately after the quorum call the acting majority leader would make a statement to that effect. Under the form of the two unanimous-consent agreements entered into we are faced with a rather complicated situation, because no time is stated when a final vote on the railway-labor bill is to be had. Does the Senator see what I mean?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think such a statement should be made, so that we may be able to vote immediately on the bill if the Senate desires to do so.

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, 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	George	Long
Anderson	Gillette	Lucas
Brewster	Gurney	McCarran
Bricker	Hayden	McCarthy
Bridges	Hendrickson	McClellan
Butler	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Byrd	Hill	McKellar
Cain	Holland	McMahon
Capehart	Hunt	Magnuson
Carlson	Ives	Malone
Chavez	Jenner	Martin
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Donnell	Kefauver	Murray
Douglas	Kerr	Neely
Dworshak	Kilgore	Nixon
Eaton	Knowland	O'Connor
Ellender	Langer	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Leahy	Pepper
Frear	Lehman	Robertson
Fulbright		Russell