est hour, the task has been accomplished, the victory has been won and they go on from strength to strength.

For us their colleagues who remain behind, we too are cheered and heartened by their examples, we have not always agreed but we have always respected each other. We have fought a good fight together and we will try to carry on where these, our brothers, left off until that great day:

When earth's last picture is painted and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest and faith we shall need it, lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall put us to work anew.

And only the Master shall praise us and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the working and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the thing as he sees it for the good of things as they are.

TAPS

Master Sgt. Edward L. Masters sounded taps, the echo being sounded by Staff Sgt. John A. Gosling.

BENEDICTION

The Chaplain pronounced the following benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift upon you His countenance and give you peace. Amen.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess, the Speaker called the House to order.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 205, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 17, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

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. SASSCER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3911. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; without amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris; with amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Kezdy-Reich; with amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros; with amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Ilona Agoston; with amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Homann and her son, John A. Villas; with amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Biagio Poidimani; with amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel; with amendment (Rept. No. 474). 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. LOVRE:

H. R. 4132. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Sisseton Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4133. A bill to provide for the payment of Federal unemployment taxes into the Federal unemployment account to be available for the administration of unemployment compensation laws and public employment offices, and to return to the States the excess of such taxes over such administrative expenses, to redefine the term "employer" as used in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Education to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of State, land-grant, and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. KEATING introduced a bill (H. R. 4134) for the relief of Kurt J. Hain, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1951

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

Almighty and everlasting God, at morning and evening and noonday, in Thy light we would see life steadily and seeing it whole discern in it Thy purpose for us and for all Thy children. Thou knowest the lure of temptation to be less than our best; Thou understandest the drain of our daily work and the limitations of our strength. In all our relationships with our fellows, grant us the grace of meekness and the power of self-control. Remove far from us all hypocrisy and pretense. Help us this day to speak only such words and to do only such things as will leave no regret. Minister, we beseech Thee, to the deepest need of our praying hearts. What no man's voice can speak openly Thou seest inwardly.

As we lift up our hearts for divine help in these baffling and perplexing days, come down the secret stairs by which Thou canst enter every contrite heart. 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 Wednesday, May 16, 1951, 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, without amendment, the bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of John K. Jackson, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Services and Foreign Relations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1613. A bill to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 320);

H. R. 2746. A bill to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 321);

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 322).

H. R. 2192. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; with amendments (Rept. No. 323);

H. R. 2416. A bill relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness; with amendments (Rept. No. 324); and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; with an amendment (Rept. No. 325).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1497. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Emilio Seabra d'Araujo; and

S. 498. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Doherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1499. A bill for the relief of Georgette Sato; and

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of Stevan Pivnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1501. A bill for the relief of Nicanor Maypa Balat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1502. A bill to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Harold Frederick D. Wolfgramm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Valmai Eileen Mackenzie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of John K. Jackson was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSAL FOR ARMISTICE BETWEEN THE CONFLICTING FORCES IN KOREA

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, before the Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum will he yield to me so I may make a unanimous-consent request to read into the RECORD a short resolution which I wish to submit and ask to have appropriately referred?

Mr. HILL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I make that unanimous-consent request, Mr. President.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas to permit civilization to be destroyed by world war III is utter insanity and unworthy of the men of this century; and

Whereas the Korean war has every appearance of being a hopeless conflict of attrition and indecisiveness and a breeder of bitter racial hatreds; and

Whereas a limited war like a limited or smoldering fire, is gravely dangerous, for it may burst forth into a world-wide conflagration at any moment; and

Whereas the North and South Koreans, the Chinese and the United Nations have suffered more than 1,000,000 casualties, with the only tangible result so far the indescribable misery which has been heaped upon the Korean people; and

Whereas tremendous strides have been made in the development of hitherto unused lethal and destructive weapons of war with potentials of unbelievable fury and horror; and

Whereas by slaughtering additional millions of humans an uneasy peace might in time be forced upon the vanquished; and

Whereas the people of the United States traditionally have held the people of China in the highest esteem and affection and still do; and

Whereas the people of the United States have long recognized the wisdom of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine so eloquently portrayed by the slogan "Asia for Asiatics" if it were to be applied to Asia; and

Whereas it has long been the policy of the American people that no nation should seek to extend its form of government over any other nation or people, but that as an inherent right every people should be left free to determine its own form of government and its own way of life, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid—the little along with the great and the powerful; and

Whereas the traditional policy and desire of the people of the United States of America is now and has been a just and enduring peace; and

Whereas it is never too early for God-fearing and peace-loving peoples to earnestly endeavor to stop needless human slaughter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations call upon all nations and all groups now engaged in the war in Korea to cease fire and declare an armistice effective at 4 a. m. (Korean time) June 25, 1951; and that prior thereto the United Nations forces retire to points south and the opposing forces retire to points north of the thirty-eighth parallel; and that before December 31, 1951, all prisoners of the Korean war shall be exchanged and all non-Korean persons, military and nonmilitary (except the ordinary diplomatic representatives), shall depart from North and South Korea.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

An address on the subject 1951 Merchandising and Management Conference, delivered by Senator SPARKMAN, on May 14, 1951, at the University of Maryland.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address by Bernard M. Baruch on the occasion of George Catlett Marshall Day at Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., May 15, 1951.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Project," published in the Utica (N. Y.) Press of March 17, 1951.

Editorial entitled "New Sources of Steel," published in the Washington Post of March 10, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

An article entitled "Small Business Is Hit by Defense Rationing," written by Joseph A. Loftus, and published in the New York Times of May 13, 1951.

An editorial entitled "Beef Rollback Is Unfair to the Cattle Feeders," published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 13, 1951, and a letter to the editor of the Tribune, entitled "Monkeys Could Manage Better," written by Fred C. Peters, of Janesville, Minn.

By Mr. BENNETT:

An editorial entitled "Where to, America?" discussing faith in God in the United States, and an editorial entitled "Pity the Poor Businessman," discussing price controls, both published in the Ephraim Enterprise, of Ephraim, Utah, on April 27, 1951.

An oration on the subject The Constitution, Worth Having, Worth Defending, by Miss Kay Jon Mildon, winner of the American Legion oratorical contest in Utah, together with a statement by Senator BENNETT.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

An editorial entitled "Policy Based on Fear," appearing in a recent issue of the Idaho Statesman, of Boise, Idaho.

By Mr. LANGER:

A pamphlet on the subject More Meat and How To Get It, With a Common Sense Meat Program, sponsored by farm organizations, livestock associations, meat-industry groups, and allied businesses.

By Mr. KERR:

A press release by him relative to proposals by General MacArthur and Republican policy.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEY EMPLOYED BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the order entered yesterday the Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar. I think before proceeding with the calendar there should be a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator propose to take up any measure for debate after the call of the calendar today?

Mr. HILL. We are very anxious, as the Senator knows, to dispose, if possible, of Calendar No. 227, Senate bill 630, to suspend until December 31, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with

respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is a bill in which the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is very much interested. I wonder if we might not proceed to the consideration of that bill today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the acting majority leader will not insist upon the consideration of that bill today. The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is ill. He is vitally interested, not in the particular case covered by the bill, but in the principle involved. He feels very strongly about it. Other members of the Committee on the Judiciary wish to discuss the matter. While some Senators are very anxious to have the bill passed, other Senators would like to be heard on it. I wonder if it would not be satisfactory to have some other measure taken up today, because of the absence of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course we want to do all we can to accommodate the Senator from Utah whose illness we very much regret. We find ourselves, however, in this position: The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], will leave the last of next week to attend the meeting of the International Conference on Labor which will be held in Geneva, Switzerland. Naturally he is very anxious to have the bill acted upon by the Senate before he leaves. Whereas the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has his problem, we also have our problem in that the Senator from Montana wishes to have the matter disposed of before he leaves for Geneva. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that we proceed with the call of the roll at this time, and I will confer further with him about the matter.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. 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	Gillette	McMahon
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kilgore	Stennis
Dirksen	Knowland	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Thye
Duff	Lodge	Underwood
Dworshak	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
George	McKellar	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the calendar is now to be called, from the beginning. The Secretary will call the first bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile was announced as first in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard; the bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION AGAINST MISBRANDING, ETC., OF FUR PRODUCTS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 508) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Senator asking that the bill go over on his own behalf, or on behalf of another Senator. If he is asking that it go over on behalf of another Senator, may I ask on whose behalf he is making the request?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is on behalf of another Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. May I inquire who the other Senator is?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am trying to ascertain the information for the Senator from Colorado. I believe three Senators requested of the calendar committee that the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should be glad to know who the Senators are.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I shall be glad to obtain the information and submit it to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection for a moment, in order that I may make a brief observation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. LODGE. I wish the RECORD to show that I have some amendments which I wish to offer to the bill when, as, and if the bill comes before the Senate. The amendments have been submitted and printed and lie on the table. I simply wish to make this statement in regard to them, following my previous statement at the time when I submitted the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the Senator from Massachusetts presented the amendments and have they been printed?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I presented them on February 22, and asked to have them printed and lie on the table, where they now are. Under date of February 22, there appears in the RECORD a statement giving all the reasons for the amendments which I presented at the request of the Furriers' Guild of Boston.

So I hope the Senator from Colorado will familiarize himself with the amendments, and naturally I hope he will support them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Massachusetts further when he is going to offer the amendments. Cannot he offer them now and have them voted either up or down?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Amendments cannot be submitted until the bill is before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I realize that.

Mr. LODGE. I simply wished to serve notice that when, as, and if the bill is before the Senate, I shall offer the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill was before the Senate only 2 minutes ago.

Mr. LODGE. In that case, I offer the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is not before the Senate, and was not before the Senate a few minutes ago. At that time the question was whether there was objection to the consideration of the bill. Objection was made, and the bill did not come before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. LODGE. Will not it be in order for me to offer the amendments when the bill is before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the bill is before the Senate, it is in order to offer amendments to it; but in the meantime the mere submission of the amendments, to be printed and lie on the table, does not mean that either the amendments or the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point I am trying to make is that if the Senator who has objected will withhold the objection, the bill can come before the Senate and the amendments can be offered and acted on in the usual way. That is the point I make.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I renew my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been made, and the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health and nursing professions, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill will go over.

The bill (S. 673) to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 41) prohibiting the sale in the District of Columbia of rockfish weighing more than 15 pounds was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Let the bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

RECONVEYANCE OF TRACT OF LAND TO TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE

The bill (H. R. 2685) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I send to the desk, for incorporation in the RECORD, a statement on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in connection with the bill. I have no objection to consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Objection was made on my request to H. R. 2685 at the last call of the calendar pending the receipt of further information which I had requested.

I now have that information at hand and it does indicate that we could, through the use of the mechanism set up in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, probably accomplish the aims of this bill more effectively and without any special legislation at all.

However, the specific case is, on the facts as presented, a meritorious one. I am informed that the land was originally donated to the Government by the Tuskegee Institute for the use of the veterans' hospital. Little use has been made of the property by the Veterans' Administration and no improvements have been placed upon it. The land is not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration. It also appears that some discretion should be allowed in reference to the reservations to be imposed so that the institute will not be prohibited from making full use of the land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2685) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 630) to suspend until December 31, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOEY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this bill should not be considered on the call of the calendar. Therefore, I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A companion Senate bill was passed over a few minutes ago.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill goes over.

The resolution (S. Res. 133) discharging the Committee on the District of Columbia from the further consideration of S. 656, the home-rule bill for the District, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the resolution goes over.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON MATCHING FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE FOR ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1244) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel, which had been reported from the Commitee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "sentence", to strike out "shall not apply to" and insert "may be varied for", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the second sentence of subsection 201 (1) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the limitations upon the making of Federal contributions contained in the second, third, and fourth provisos of this sentence may be varied for the Territory of Alaska."

(b) Subsection 403 (b) of such act is amended by inserting, immediately after the second sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "After appointment and qualification for office, the director of civil defense of any State, and any subordinate civil defense officer within such State designated by the director in writing, shall be qualified to administer any such oath within such State under such regulations as the director shall prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 841) to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be made a star print of this bill (S. 841) and the Report No. 310, for the purpose of correcting certain technical errors which have been discovered since the bill was reported and since the report was printed.

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

CHANGES IN PROCEDURE WHEREBY ADMIRALS OF NAVY AND GENERALS OF MARINE CORPS ARE SELECTED FOR RETENTION IN ACTIVE SERVICE

The bill (S. 1039) to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended by—

(a) Inserting in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 305 after the word "senior", the words "in permanent rank."

(b) Inserting in the first sentence of subsection (f) of section 314 between the words "active" and "list", the words "or retired" and deleting in the third proviso of that subsection the words "major general on the active list" and substituting therefor the words "major general or above on the active or retired list."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 35) to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ACCEPTANCES OF CONDITIONAL GIFTS TO FURTHER THE DEFENSE EFFORT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1230) to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment on page 2, line 16, after the word "made", to strike out "may" and insert "shall", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That to further the defense effort of the United States—

(a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of money or other intangible personal property made on condition that it be used for a particular defense effort; and

(b) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of other property, real or personal, or services, made on condition that it be used for a particular defense effort.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury may convert into money, at the best terms available, any such gift of intangible property other than money; and the Administrator of General Services may convert into money, at the best terms available, any such gift of tangible property, or transfer to any other Federal agency without reimbursement such property as he may determine usable for the particular purpose for which it was donated.

SEC. 3. There shall be established on the books of the Treasury a special account into which shall be deposited all money received as a result of such gifts.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury, in order to effectuate the purposes for which gifts accepted under this act are made, shall from time to time pay the money in such special account to such of the various appropriation accounts as in his judgment will best effectuate the intent of the donors, and such money is hereby appropriated and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of the appropriations to which paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to Senate bill 1230, Calendar 297, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD that portion of the committee report which appears on page 3, entitled "Provisions of S. 1230."

There being no objection, the portion of the committee report referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISIONS OF S. 1230

S. 1230, as submitted to the Congress by the Treasury Department, would enable the Government of the United States to accept gifts of money and other property, real and personal, as well as services, conditioned upon their use for a particular purpose.

Section 1 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept or reject gifts of money or other intangible personal property made to the United States, carrying a condition to the effect that they be used for some particular defense purpose. It would also authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept or reject gifts of other property, real or personal, as well as services.

Section 2 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services to convert into cash any gifts of intangible or tangible property other than money. It would also authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to any other Federal agency without reimbursement such property as he may determine usable for the particular purpose for which it was donated.

Section 3 would establish on the books of the Treasury a special account into which conditional gifts of money and the proceeds of all other conditional gifts, would be deposited.

Section 4 would require the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the money in this special account to the various appropriation accounts made for the purpose of purchasing defense matériel and furthering the defense effort of the United States, in such a manner that the gifts would be used, as far as practicable, for the purposes for which they have been donated. This section would also automatically appropriate the money received by the Treasury for such specific purposes.

Under the provisions of this bill, the type of conditional gifts which may be accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury is limited to money and other intangible property, such as bonds, securities, and stocks. Gifts of real and personal property and services would

be handled by the Administrator of General Services. In all cases, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services would be authorized to either accept or reject any particular gift as they saw fit.

REPRESENTATION OF APPELLANTS BY CERTAIN VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The bill (S. 831) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U. S. C. 863), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 14." and by adding the following new subsection:

"(b) Any appellant under section 12 of this act or under this section may choose as his or her designated representative an accredited representative of any of the following veterans' organizations: American Legion; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II; United Spanish War Veterans; American Veterans' Committee, Inc.; Disabled American Veterans; Marine Corps League; Army Mutual Aid Association; Army and Navy Union, U. S. A.; Blinded Veterans' Association; Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; Coast Guard League; Fleet Reserve Association; Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Military Order of the Purple Heart; Military Order of the World Wars; National Society—Army of Philippines; National Tribune; Navy Mutual Aid Association; Regular Veterans' Association; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars; United Indian War Veterans, U. S. A.; Grand Army of the Republic; and any other veterans' organization incorporated or recognized by act of Congress or recognized as such by the United States Civil Service Commission under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe for such purpose. The Civil Service Commission—

(1) shall prescribe such rules, regulations, and standards as it shall deem appropriate for the conduct by such organizations and accredited representatives thereof of their duties pursuant to such sections; and

(2) may withdraw from any such organization or any accredited representative thereof its recognition pursuant to this section for the failure of such organization or accredited representative to comply with such rules, regulations, and standards, and thereafter may restore such recognition to any such organization or accredited representative under such terms and conditions as the Commission shall deem necessary to insure future compliance by such organization or accredited representative with such rules, regulations, and standards.

PURCHASE BY UNITED STATES OF YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION PROPERTY IN PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 718) to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am very glad to give an explanation.

Mr. President, the property is located in the very heart of the city of Phoenix, and is adjacent to the present Federal courthouse. Included in the property is a substantial tract of land. When that land is combined with the courthouse property, and a city park area, which will be donated, the Government will own all but a corner of the entire block.

The directors of the Young Men's Christian Association advise me that they are compelled to sell the property because they are building a new YMCA building at a somewhat greater distance from the center of the city, and that if they can make with the Government an arrangement to pay 5 years' rent, they will turn over to the United States the title to the building and land at the end of the 5 years. So the amount to be paid contemplates the purchase price of the building, plus what will have to be paid as interest on a bank loan during the 5-year period. The payments are to be made quarterly by the Government, and at the end of 5 years the Government will own the property. It is a real bargain for the Government. It was indicated to me that the owners had received other offers for the property, but that they wanted to see this site reserved, because it would be a proper site for a Federal building, at some future time, and, as businessmen resident in the city, they would be willing to wait until June in order to see whether Congress would act favorably upon their offer. If not, they will sell the YMCA building and lot to someone else. I may say that property values in Phoenix have substantially increased, and they will have no difficulty in getting an equal or better price for the property, but they prefer to have the Government own it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, since this represents a bargain for the Government, the junior Senator from New Jersey cannot object.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is the purchase price?

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill provides a ceiling of $290,000 on the purchase price. The average rental which is being paid by the Government in the city of Phoenix at this time is $1.77 per square foot. It varies from less than the $1 to $3 per square foot. When this property is acquired, the Federal offices can move from the high-rent sections of the city, where they are presently located. This office space is needed immediately by the Government, and in this way it will be possible to save Federal funds immediately.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator from Arizona will yield, I should like to inquire whether he made a personal investigation of the matter, and whether after such investigation, he recommends it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have examined it and I recommend the purchase.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 718), which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment on page 2, line 15, after the word "States.", to insert "The rentals and the purchase price to be paid by the United States pursuant to this act shall not exceed $290,000 in the aggregate.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services, without regard to the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, is authorized to negotiate and enter into a lease-purchase agreement providing for the lease to the United States for a term of 5 years of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz., being that certain real property located at the northeast corner of Second Avenue and Monroe Street, having an area of approximately 31,000 square feet, and more particularly described as the south two hundred and twenty feet of the west one hundred and forty feet of block 93 of the city of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Ariz., as shown in book 2 of maps, page 51, together with all structures thereon and appurtenances thereto, and providing further for the vesting in the United States absolutely of title to the leased property upon expiration of the 5-year term.

SEC. 2. The agreement authorized by section 1 shall provide for the payment of rental and other consideration in such amounts and at such times and shall contain such other terms and conditions as the Administrator of General Services in his discretion shall deem to be in the best interest of the United States. The rentals and the purchase price to be paid by the United States pursuant to this act shall not exceed $290,000 in the aggregate.

SEC. 3. Payments that shall become due from the United States in pursuance of any agreement entered into under the authority of this act shall be paid from appropriations available to the General Services Administration for the payment of rents, and such additional funds as may be necessary to provide for such payments are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 279, House bill 1612, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1612), which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, because of the illness of my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr.

MILLIKIN], it is not proposed to proceed today with the consideration of this bill. It is our intention to have the Senate recess until Monday, and to proceed to the consideration of the bill at that time, with this exception: I understand that the conferees on the part of the Senate may reach an agreement with the House conferees on the third supplemental appropriation bill, which is now in conference, and, if an agreement is reached, the Senator from Arizona, chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, may wish on Monday to proceed to the consideration of the conference report. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether I am correct in that statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct, and I have no doubt that the conference report will be ready by that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair reminds Senators that a conference report is privileged.

Mr. HILL. I desired to give notice to the Senate, that on Monday, when the Senate reconvenes, we shall proceed to the consideration of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, subject, however, to the condition that, if the conferees on the third supplemental appropriation bill have in the meantime agreed on a report, the Senator from Arizona will call up the conference report; which he may do, since, as the Chair states, a conference report is a privileged matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. NORRELL had been appointed as an additional manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

CONFIRMATION OF SUNDRY NOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I report favorably the nominations of six persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard and the nominations of nine persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Coast Guard.

While these are routine nominations, early consideration of them is important for this reason: These men are merchant marine officers (some of them have their masters' licenses) who have been accepted for probationary appointment and training and eventual commissions as officers in the Coast Guard. Upon completion of their indoctrination and training they will engage in merchant marine safety work. They have resigned from their old jobs and are now marking time awaiting confirmation by the Senate. They cannot take their oaths of office and begin their indoctrination until they have been confirmed, and the Coast Guard cannot set up its training class for these men until the Senate acts.

As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether these are merely routine nominations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They are routine nominations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has stated that these men resigned from their jobs. What jobs have they held, prior to this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They were in civilian positions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In what capacity?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They served in whatever capacities they happened to be called upon to fill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator mean that they resigned civilian positions in order to enroll in the United States Coast Guard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. They resigned in order to take these appointments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

COMPLAINT OF AN AIR CORPS OFFICER'S WIFE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have received a letter, which is very brief, from Tularosa, N. Mex., dated May 8, 1951. It is a letter from one of my constituents, the wife of an Air Corps officer in Korea. The letter reads as follows:

TULAROSA, N. MEX., *May 8, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I am enclosing two newspaper clippings from the newspapers published in Japan, and which were sent to me by my husband who has been stationed there with the 56th Strategic Reconnaissance Squadron for more than a year. In all fairness to the men overseas, who do not definitely know the length of their tours, do you honestly believe this is an example of justice? The morale of the men is at an all-time low and this very thing of letting one certain dependent fly to join her husband, though all dependent travel is closed, has not helped matters in the least.

Honestly, Senator CHAVEZ, is this fair?

Respectfully yours,

MRS. LYLE H. DANKE.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the two newspaper clippings enclosed with Mrs. Danke's letter.

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

MRS. RIDGWAY PACKS FOR JOURNEY TO TOKYO; WILL ARRIVE SATURDAY

WASHINGTON.—Youthful, attractive Mrs. Mary A. Ridgway, wife of the United Nations Far East supreme commander, interrupted her packing long enough Monday to tell International News Service she was looking forward to enjoying the scenic beauty of Japan.

In an exclusive interview, Mrs. Ridgway said she would leave for Tokyo "Wednesday or Thursday" with her 2-year-old son Matthew, Jr., whom she calls "Matty."

(General Ridgway's office reported Tuesday that Mrs. Ridgway is scheduled to arrive in Tokyo Saturday.)

Matty has trouble pronouncing the letter "T", she said, and has been saying that he is "going to see daddy in Kokyo."

The general's wife said her principal hobbies are painting—still life, landscape, and seascape—and flower arranging. Some of her paintings and flower arrangements, she said, have won prizes in competition.

MRS. RIDGWAY DUE SOON

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Mrs. Mary A. Ridgway, wife of Far Eastern Commander Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, said Friday she and 2-year-old Matthew, Jr., will fly to Tokyo next week. A Defense Department spokesman said Mrs. Ridgway's departure is scheduled tentatively for May 2. The Ridgways will probably fly in the late President Roosevelt's C-54, the "Sacred Cow."

RIGHTS OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN MARRIED TO BRITISH SUBJECT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me bring to the attention of the Senate an interesting case concerning an American citizen, born in Illinois, who married a British subject in 1931, and from 1932 until 1940 resided in England. Never at any time did she renounce or lose her United States citizenship and, in fact, at all times held a United States passport.

At the outbreak of World War II, although she happened to be in the United States, she made no attempt to transfer ownership of any of her American assets, but fully and immediately complied with the British Finance Act of September 3, 1939, by listing all her United States securities and then remitting her entire dollar income to the Bank of England. In addition, she complied with the British order to send all her dollar capital moneys which accrued, such as inheritances or matured bonds, to England. In this way a large percentage of her total assets were transferred to England and were used by the British Government, who gave her unconvertible pounds in return.

When the husband of this American citizen was sent to the Middle East in 1940 with his regiment, she brought her two small children to the United States, as their only home was right in the center of London. The irony of it is that although she was returning to her own country, she was forced to depend on loans from her family for the entire support of herself and her two children. This was not because she had no dollars, but solely because, according to British wartime laws, she was ordered to remit her entire dollar income regularly to the Bank of England. In fact, therefore,

from the beginning of the war in 1939 until the middle of 1946, she never spent $1 of her own, being forced to rely entirely on unsecured loans from her mother, although living here in her own country the entire time. All the United States dollars which she sent to England are still there in devalued pounds and the British Treasury refuses to allow them to be reconverted, even at the present devalued rate, which represents a loss of over 40 percent of the value of the dollars which she gave to England in her emergency.

This American citizen has never returned to resume residence in England since she left in 1940. In fact, she has only been in England for 1 month, on a business trip, during the past 11 years. At the time when the largest single capital transfer—a sale of United States Treasury bonds—took place on orders from the Bank of England, she had already been back on this continent for almost a year. She knew that she would probably never return to England to live, and in fact, began divorce proceedings the year after the war was over. She certainly never thought that when the emergency was over, she would be still further penalized for an act done in good faith at an hour of need.

It seems to me that here we have an example of the way Great Britain is treating American citizens—an American citizen who did her best to aid England by sending over her United States dollars when she was already back in the United States. Not only has she not had the use of this money for the past 12 years, but having lost 40 percent due to the devaluation of the pound, she is not even now, 6 years after the war, allowed to reconvert the remainder.

Mr. President, I believe that citizens of the United States who have proved their citizenship and who have complied with all of the recommendations of the British Government are deserving of more equitable treatment with respect to their property. Insofar as I am informed, the treatment of British nationalists in the United States has been to allow them to return with their property. It occurs to me the British Government and the banks should grant our nationalists the same recognition.

DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN TRADE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senate has just agreed to consider the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It is on this subject that I wish to address the Senate briefly.

Our common objective is to raise the standard of living of the peoples of the world to our standard. Some of us believe that we must hold our standard of living while we are assisting foreign nations to raise their own.

There are those, however, in contrast, that believe that the only way to secure world peace is to divide our wealth with the nations of the world so that the average standard of living will be uniform in all of the nations of the globe.

THE PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The junior Senator from Nevada believes that we should develop foreign trade on the principle of fair and reasonable competition, thus maintaining our standard of living while we are assisting foreign nations to raise their own.

Through the fair and reasonable competition principle the incentive to hold the standard of living down in foreign countries is eliminated, since the differential is paid in the form of a tariff or import fee and no profit can be gained.

A raise in the living standards of the competitive nations would be recognized by a corresponding reduction in such import fee, and when world standards approximate our own then free trade would be the almost immediate and automatic result.

SECRETARY OF STATE DOMINATES INVESTORS AND WORKINGMEN

The bill (H. R. 1612) extending the Trade Agreements Act, in simple terms, provides for a 2-year extension of the power over the workingmen and investors of this Nation, by a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State.

I repeat that there is nothing in the bill that directs the President or the Secretary of State to conform to the amendments to the bill.

PERIL POINTS AND ESCAPE CLAUSE A DELUSION

Based upon the administration's 18-year record the so-called peril point and the escape clause committee amendments are delusions to wet down the workingmen and investors of this Nation while they undergo another 2 years of uncertainty with the investors backing away from their industries and the workmen's jobs and home investments made increasingly uncertain.

BIG AND SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED

Big business is for free trade and small business is against it.

Big business is any business in a financial position to install branch plants in the foreign low-wage living standard nations and ship their products into this country under the free-trade program.

The small business and the workingmen cannot possibly compete with such slave labor products imported into this country, except through writing down the wages and investments to conform to the world conditions—which can only mean a substantial reduction in the standard of living of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Politics of World Trade," under the title "Washington Affairs," by Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette of April 16, 1951, outlining the one world thinkers background as a foundation for the whole free tree trade program in direct conformance with the Karl Marx social revolution plan of 102 years ago.

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

WASHINGTON AFFAIRS

(By Holmes Alexander)

THE POLITICS OF WORLD TRADE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator MALONE, whose tariff speeches often empty the Senate Chamber, says there's a reason for this mass exodus. He tells me:

"Those fellows know they can't answer me back. I've got the facts."

He's got the facts all right, probably more than anyone else on Capitol Hill. But it's like giving castor oil to a teen-ager to make the Senate open up and absorb them.

Any day now the Finance Committee will come in with its new 2-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and MALONE's going to have to sit on the Senate's chest in order to pour down enough facts to beat this administration measure.

Still, it's a subject that needs to be better understood if only because reciprocal trading is the granddaddy of the Roosevelt-Truman give-away policy, dating back to 1934. Such slighting remarks as that one are sure to incur the scorn of one-world thinkers, including a number of short-sighted industrialists whose overseas factories are coining profits on dime-an-hour wages.

But the long-term result of this tariff plan is that American small-business men are pushed to the wall, American farmers have to be subsidized by the taxpayer and American workers face unemployment every time we're not having a war or a war crisis.

Despite all the highbrow gibberish about enlightened self-interest in world commerce, reciprocal trading is reciprocal nonsense. It is a sort of half-wit brother to free trading, a nineteenth century one worldism, of which Karl Marx spoke with great affection. Addressing a group of comrades at Brussels in 1848, Marx said:

"The free-trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries the antagonism of the proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the free-trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade."

Marx, without a doubt, would have been in favor of the recent Torquay conference which showed the Reciprocal Trade Act in operation. At this 34-nation tariff talk, the United States agreed to slash import duties up to 50 percent on about 3,000 items, while 17 foreign nations reciprocated by making token cuts on a good many fewer items. Britain, along with its Commonwealth partners, declined to make any concessions at all although receiving some. France actually raised her import tariffs on some 38 items. In round figures we made a $477,000,000 concession, and the foreigners made one of $53,000,000. It was a great day for share-the-wealth internationalism.

MALONE has a bill of his own (S. 981) which would take foreign trade bargaining away from the State Department globalists and turn it over to a six-member Foreign Trade Authority which would work closely with Congress. S. 981 calls for flexible tariffs to make sure that imported items are not substantially below the price of domestic articles. MALONE might be able to sell this common-sense proposition if enough Senators would sit still and listen.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Suspending the Copper Duty," which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette of April 5, 1951.

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

SUSPENDING THE COPPER DUTY

Unanimous approval has been given by the House Ways and Means Committee on a bill to suspend the import tax on copper. This measure is pushed by the copper fabricators in the East, and is supported by the Truman administration.

The Nation needs for its defense program all the copper it can get, and domestic pro-

duction is meeting only about two-thirds of the present consumption. The one-third imported comes directly from Chile where United States copper companies, especially Anaconda and Kennecott have large holdings.

An import tax of 4 cents a pound was levied on copper in 1932, later was cut in half by reciprocal tariff agreements. The 2-cent impost was suspended for imports by the Government during the war, and in 1947 for all copper imports, but went back into force last July 1.

Lifting the import tax will not bring in additional stores of copper as much as it will be a subsidy to the foreign producers and to the American manufacturers, and this at the expense of the domestic copper industry.

The South American copper, or the red metal from any other foreign countries, is mined and refined at extremely low cost. The United States industry, paying the highest wages in the world, cannot compete with the cheaply-produced foreign copper. Already many of the mines and smelters in this country have shut down or are operating at limited capacity, for they cannot meet such competition.

The administration has opposed the copper duty, claiming that it is against the good-neighbor policy of the New Deal and the Tru Deal. At the same time the Government calls upon the American mining industry to speed its output of strategic metals, then would penalize the local producers by letting in the foreign product at an even cheaper price.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1 TO 12

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I submit amendments Nos. 1 to 12, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with a statement accompanying each amendment, to be printed at the end of each amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the amendments and statements will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendments and statements are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

"(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

"(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports;

"(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

"(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

"(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

"RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

"SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 30, 1951, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

"FORMATION OF FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

"SEC. 3. Title III, part II, section 330, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 330. Organization of the Foreign Trade Authority.

"'(a) Membership: The United States Tariff Commission shall be reorganized and reconstituted as the Foreign Trade Authority (hereinafter referred to as the "Authority") to be composed of six directors to be hereafter appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The original directors of the Authority shall be the same persons now serving as Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission, each such person to serve as a director of the Authority until the date when his term of office as a Commissioner of the United States Tariff Commission would have expired. Thereafter the term of office of any successor to any such director shall expire 6 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed except that a director appointed to fill a vacancy occurring for any reason other than the expiration of a term as herein provided shall be appointed only for the remainder of the term which his predecessor would otherwise have served. Directors shall be eligible for appointment to succeed themselves if otherwise qualified therefor. No person shall be eligible for appointment as a director unless he is a citizen of the United States, and, in the judgment of the President, is possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the provisions of this act. Not more than three of the directors shall be members of the same political party, and in making appointments members of different political parties shall be appointed alternately as nearly as may be practicable.

"'(b) Chairman, Vice Chairman, and salary: The President shall annually designate one of the directors as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman of the Authority. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in case of absence or disability of the Chairman. A majority of the directors in office shall constitute a quorum, but the Authority may function notwithstanding vacancies. Each director shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year. No director shall actively engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a director.'

"APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY

"SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 331 (a), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Personnel: The Authority shall appoint a secretary who shall receive compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and the Authority is hereby empowered to employ and, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, fix the compensations of such special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees of the Authority as it may find necessary for the proper performance of its duties.'

"ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 5. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding at the end of section 331 the following new section:

"'SEC. 331A. Administration of Trade Agreements.

"'(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Authority, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"'(b) The Authority is hereby authorized and directed—

"'(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

"'(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this act.'

"PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

"SEC. 6. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 336. Periodic Adjustment of Import Duties.

"'(a) The Authority is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"'(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Authority shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"'(1) The lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"'(2) Any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"'(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"'(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"'(5) The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"'(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"'(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies, excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"'(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Authority either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Authority until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"'(d) The Authority, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of said act.

"'(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Authority is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"'(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Authority shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Authority and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"'(g) No order shall be announced by the Authority under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Authority finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"'(h) The Authority, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

"'(i) For the purpose of this section—

"'(1) the term "domestic article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term "foreign article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"'(2) the term "United States" includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"'(3) the term "foreign country" means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"'(4) the term "landed duty paid price" means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"'(j) The Authority is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"'(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry.'

"AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

"SEC. 7. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word 'President' and substituting therefor the word 'Authority.'

"(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

"(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

"(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Authority, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Authority, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry.'

"(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Authority has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Authority may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.'

"(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Authority shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exist.'

"CONTINUANCE OF PERSONNEL, FUNDS, ACTIONS, AND SO FORTH

"SEC. 8. Section 339 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 339. Effect of Enactment.

"'(a) All personnel, property, records, balance of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) to the United States Tariff Commission shall be transferred to the Authority for use in connection with the exercise of its functions; and such transfer shall not operate to change the status of the officers and employees transferred from the Commission to the Authority. No investigation or other proceeding pending before the Commission at such time shall abate by reason of such transfer but shall continue under the provisions of this act.

"'(b) Wherever in the Tariff Act of 1930, or in any other law, the terms "United States Tariff Commission" or "Commission" occur, such terms shall be construed to mean the "Foreign Trade Authority" and the "Authority," respectively.'

"REAPPLICATION OF SECTION 516 (O)

"SEC. 9. Section 17, subsection (c), of the Act of June 25, 1938, chapter 679, is hereby repealed.

"STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

"SEC. 10. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Foreign Trade Authority is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final.'

"REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

"SEC. 11. The Authority, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 12. This act shall take effect as of June 30, 1951.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.' "

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment substitutes the flexible import fee bill, S. 981, for H. R. 1612 as presently reported. The title is amended to read, "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes." This substitute for the Trade Agreements Act provides for the following:

(a) It would turn the present Tariff Commission into a Foreign Trade Authority with the authority over tariff rates similar to the authority possessed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in determining freight and passenger rates.

(b) It would establish the principle of fair and reasonable competition between domestically produced goods and imports.

(c) It would permit the Foreign Trade Authority to change the tariff rates now in effect in accordance with the above principle.

(d) It would make into law the present tariff rates as established under the 1930 Tariff Act and section 350 thereof.

(e) It would provide for orderly termination of existing trade agreements under the terms thereof.

(f) It would return to Congress the responsibility over tariff making without logrolling by requiring definite legislative action to disapprove changes made by the Foreign Trade Authority.

AMENDMENT No. 2

On page 1, line 8, strike out "2 years" and insert "1 year."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment provides for the extension of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, for the period of 1 year, beginning June 12, 1951.

AMENDMENT No. 3

On page 3, line 18, after "Defense", insert the following: "from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, from the Committee on Finance of the Senate."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment provides that the President shall seek information and advice from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and from the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in addition to the departments and sources mentioned in section 3 (c).

AMENDMENT No. 4

On page 4, beginning in line 7, with the word "Within", strike out through the word "been" in line 9 and insert the following: "No trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be."

Beginning on page 4, with comma in line 21, strike out through the word "with" on page 5, line 12.

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes it mandatory upon the President, instead of leaving it optional, to adhere to the peril-point determinatons made by the Tariff Commission under section 3.

AMENDMENT No. 5

On page 5, line 25, after "practicable", insert the following: "(which shall not be later than six months after (1) the enactment of this act, or (2) the occasion for such action arises, whichever is later)."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes it mandatory upon the President to suspend, withdraw or prevent the application of tariff reductions, etc., to the U. S. S. R. and satellite nations within 6 months after the enactment of this act, or after the occasion for such withdrawal, etc., arises. This takes into consideration that other nations may fall under Russia's domination and will force the President to withdraw benefits to such countries within 6 months.

AMENDMENT No. 6

On page 8, line 19, after the word "practicable", insert the following: "(which shall not be later than 12 months after the enactment of this act)."

On page 8, line 23, after the period, insert the following: "Any trade agreement which cannot be brought into conformity with such policy as provided in this subsection shall be terminated by the President at the earliest date provided for by its terms or by law."

On page 9, beginning with line 1, strike out through the comma in line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Within 30 days after the expiration of 12 months after the enactment of this act."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes it mandatory upon the President to include the new escape clause in existing trade agreements within 12 months after the enactment of this act, and forces termination of trade ageements with those nations that are not willing to have this new escape clause included.

AMENDMENT No. 7

On page 11, line 6, strike out "may" and insert "shall."

On page 11, beginning in line 10 with the word "If", strike out through line 15.

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes binding upon the President adherence to the recommendations made by the Tariff Commission under the escape clause.

AMENDMENT No. 8

On page 11, line 20, after "conclusions" insert "and the reasons therefor."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment more closely defines the responsibility of the Tariff Commission in making and publishing a report if it finds that no sufficient reason exists for duty adjustments under the escape clause.

AMENDMENT No. 9

On page 13, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"(c) No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect with respect to any agricultural commodity during any period in which a subsidy is being paid with respect to such commodity, or the price of such commodity is being supported, by any department or agency of the United States."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment removes the application of the most-favored-nation treatment, thereby preventing foreign nations from obtaining benefits from the United States without giving any concession in return.

AMENDMENT No. 10

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. (a) The third sentence of subsection (a) (2) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the most-favored-nation clause), is amended by striking out 'of all foreign countries,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'only of those foreign countries which are parties to the particular agreements requiring or making appropriate such proclaimed duties and restrictions and shall so apply to such articles.'

"(b) This section shall take effect 90 days after enactment of this act."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment withdraws tariff concessions or other benefits given under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on agricultural commodities for which a subsidy or price-support program is in operation.

AMENDMENT No. 11

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. No foreign-trade agreement shall hereafter be negotiated or entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to any article unless the principal supplier of such article is a party to such negotiations and to such agreement. The principal supplier of any article shall be the country growing, producing, or manufacturing the largest quantity of such article imported into the United States for consumption during the three calendar years ending last prior to the beginning of such negotiations."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes mandatory the use of the principal supplier rule, thereby forcing the Executive to make reductions in duties on certain commodities only with those nations which are the principal beneficiaries under such reduction.

AMENDMENT No. 12

Beginning on page 1, with line 5, strike out through line 24 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession required or made appropriate by any foreign-trade agreement entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, after enactment of this act, shall be proclaimed or permitted to continue in effect after the enactment of this act."

On page 8, line 9, strike out "hereafter."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment prohibits the making of further trade agreements, but retains all the present features of H. R. 1612 which pertain to trade agreements already in effect.

THE FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the substitute offered under amendment No. 1 would establish, through congressional action, of the fair and reasonable competition principle a foreign-trade authority to adjust tariffs and import fees in the same manner that Congress long ago established the reasonable return on the investment principle in the fixing of freight rates, to be administered by an independent commission named the Interstate Commerce Commission.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 1149

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate bill 271, to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, passed the Senate some time ago and has been approved by the President. A similar bill, House bill 1149, was received from the House, having passed the House, and was ordered to lie on the table in the Senate. In view of the approval of the Senate bill, the House bill, without objection, will be indefinitely postponed.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 21, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1951:

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Robert P. Fasulo (naval academy) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Midshipman Richard L. Anderton (naval academy) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy:

John R. Arnold	Roger J. Lahn
Clifford S. Babcock	Robert G. Landon
Walter L. Briant	Arthur R. Loomer
Bradford N. Bunnell	David I. McGinnis
Burford A. Carlson	Vincent J. Madden
William F. Dudek	Richard B. Oldenburg
Owen W. Dykema	Royc C. Pichler
William H. Finn	Francis L. Ready
Richard T. Fling	Harry A. Saunders
Robert W. Gillespie	Robert DeL. Schbert
Monroe C. Gollaher	Douglas J. Smith
Douglas C. Gregory	William R. Sonnemann
John G. Guffner	Howard C. Springer
Richard B. Hansen	David W. Tompkins
Lawrence C. Hartley	George C. Schitzer
Henry F. Herbig	John R. Shaughnessy
Hugh P. Janes	
Carl W. Koch	

Ronald D. Hartell (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name.

Byron S. Hollingshead, Jr. (naval ROTC) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Carl E. Wilbur

LIEUTENANT

John B. Riggsbee

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Howard Adler
Robert W. Gibson
James E. Odell
Nahum R. Shulman

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

LIEUTENANTS

Charles W. Fain, Jr.
Paul M. Leyden

Walter N. Johnson (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Thomas G. Akers
James H. Berrian
Joseph C. Boudreaux, Jr.
Richard M. Cox
Daniel M. Goodacre III
James P. Milano
Thomas G. Mitchell
Richard L. Sedam
Joseph M. Tyler, Jr.
Harry L. Wise

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Hilda Evans
Dorothy M. Hanson
Rebecca H. Jackson
Patricia H. MacDonald
Patricia A. Miller
Barbara Norris
Anna E. Venishnick
Clara P. Wienczek

POSTMASTER

The following-named person to be postmaster:

Ross A. Hancher to be postmaster at Elwood, Ind., in place of J. P. Mack, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Excutive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1951:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

James N. Jensen
Joseph N. Gonyeau
Walter C. Schafran
Robert B. Black
William G. Roden
Sidney F. Hansen

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert L. Smith
Walter Folger
Frederick O. Wooley
Thomas Osman, Jr.
Lyle W. Lemos
Frederick W. Folger
John V. Caffrey
Hollis M. Walker, Jr.
Henry E. Engelbrecht

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray that Thou wilt strengthen and encourage our minds and hearts during this day with a reassuring sense of the reality of Thy greatness and goodness.

Forgive us for allowing ourselves at times to be so faithless and to feel that the noble ideals and principles, which we cherish, have lost their luster and will never be victorious.

Send us forth with new faith and hope as we pray and labor for the coming of Thy kingdom of peace and good will. Give us the intrepid spirit of the pioneer and patriot who revealed the splendor of their souls when the course which they pursued was beset by hardship and suffering.

May Thy ways of righteousness and justice and blessedness for all mankind become so clear and commanding that we shall never doubt and darken them by our indifference or by our heartless prejudices and selfish ambitions.

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. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 872. An act to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-21.

SUNDRY FORMER STUDENTS OF THE AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps. I may say that an identical bill, H. R. 3562, passed the House on May 15.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Raymond Pohl, Jr., 505A Magnolia Avenue, Frederick, Md., $83.95; Dan K. Rawlings, 205 Laurel Avenue, Corbin, Ky., $13.10; Harold L. Reed, 201 West Lindell Street, West Frankfort, Ill., $12.20; Marcus A. Sessi, 417 West Pennview Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $8; Robert D. Simmons, 835½ Broadway, New Orleans, La., $23.85; Harry P. Smith, Jr., 2225 Chesapeake Avenue, Hampton, Va., $60.66; Paul E. Smith, 2109 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $6.10; Raymond C. Sowko, Glennland Apartments, State College, Pa., $444.40; Clyde C. Spears, 347 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky., $236.60; Donald E. Spears, 123 West Central Avenue, Belle, W. Va., $212.70; Homer R. Steele, route 1, Fairview, W. Va., $142; John D. Stiles, Wadestown, W. Va., $110.20; George F. Stock, Jr., Hollandale, Miss., $236.95; David A. Stockton, 105 East Seventh Street, box 256, Ritzville, Wash., $179.65; Frank A. Sullivan, 7949 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $396.80; William K. Sutton, 981 Fincastle Road, Lexington, Ky., $141.25; Floyd Ramsey Tarr, 3729 Marlamont Drive, Weirton, W. Va., $170.05; Hagop H. Terzagian, 217 Myrtle Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., $338.85; Jack Alfred Thalimer, 4518 West Grace Street, Richmond, Va., $226.80; Eugene R. Thomas, 9 South York Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $223.20; Forest G. Thompson, 2201 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Ky., $157.80; Joseph C. Thompson, box 700, O. M. S., Travis AFB, Fairview, Calif., $423.25; Thomas W. Tigertt, box 93, Wilmer, Tex., $583.90; Richard J. Torchia, 630 Dow Avenue, Carnegie, Pa., $229.80; Lee C. Truman, Jr., 2422 Allen Street, Owensboro, Ky., $252.40; Charles B. Upshaw, 394 West Wesley Road, Northwest, Atlanta, Ga., $191; George J. Walters, Jr., 438 South Dallas Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., $435.55; Gilbert Watz, 834 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., $366.45; Arthur J. Weinsten, 501 Manheim Street (22-A), Philadelphia, Pa., $200.10; Robert J. Weiss, 111 West Cherryhill Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $239.25; James Bernard Welborn, 442 Cherry Street, Russellville, Ky., $107.55; Earl M. Williams, box 204, Evarts, Ky., $297.50; Edwin J. Williams, Jr., 1832 Chuckatuck Avenue, Petersburg, Va., $505.60; Charles P. Wilson, Jr., route 1, Walkersville, W. Va., $404.16; and Harold W. Wilson, 205½ Fourth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., $324.20. The payment of said sums shall be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damages to or loss or destruction of personal property as a result of a fire that occurred on June 28, 1948, in the building in which they were quartered at Langley Air Force Base, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 3562 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 56]

Adair
Anderson, Calif.
Angell
Bailey
Baker
Barrett
Beamer
Bonner
Bosone
Bray
Brownson
Buckley
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Case
Chudoff
Colmer
Crumpacker
Dawson
Deane
Dingell
Dorn
Elliott
Ellsworth
Gillette
Granahan
Green
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Kennedy
Kersten, Wis.
Kirwan
Latham
McGrath
Magee
Marshall

Miller, Calif.	Powell	Roosevelt
Miller, N. Y.	Ramsay	Sasscer
Morgan	Redden	Scott, Hardie
Moulder	Reed, N. Y.	Shelley
Murray, Wis.	Richards	Sheppard
Perkins	Roberts	Smith, Miss.
Poage	Rogers, Tex.	Thomas

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. NORRELL, be included as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Senate will be notified accordingly.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY TO THE PEOPLE OF EL SALVADOR

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas earthquakes of major proportions in El Salvador on May 6 and 7, 1951, have resulted in the loss of many lives, untold suffering, and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property, rendering homeless and destitute thousands of people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the deepest sympathy of the Congress and the people of the United States be extended to the President and the people of El Salvador in this dark hour of their suffering and distress.

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

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I should like to say that this is a resolution of sympathy to the people of El Salvador. A small country has suffered a grievous disaster in the earthquake shocks of last week. The gentleman from Missouri and I visited El Salvador last autumn in connection with the inauguration of their new president, Oscar Osorio, and while there we had an opportunity to see something of the country. It is a very friendly country to the United States, and has often demonstrated its friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I might observe that this resolution carries no appropriation, authorizes none, and involves no junkets for anybody. I hope it will receive, as I am sure it deserves, unanimously favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to comment that it should be remembered El Salvador has usually been the first country among our good neighbors to the south of us to come to the support of the United States in its international decisions. As I recall it El Salvador was the first nation to join in the declaration of war against Germany and Japan. I had an opportunity to visit El Salvador some years ago. I was asked to make a speech in Spanish in behalf of the American delegation there. They are a grand people, good neighbors, and good friends of ours. I join in the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF LAND BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, ETC. (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that under the Rules of the House I am entitled to 1 hour, during which time I can yield to other Members without, however, yielding the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a brief as to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I trust Members will give me their close attention because this is one of the most important bills or measures that will be considered by the House of Representatives during this session, for it has as its objective the keeping of control in the Congress of the United States over land acquisitions and disposals in the Department of Defense and the Civil Defense Administration. The Committee on Armed Services unanimously, and the committee is composed of some 35 members, respectfully request the House of Representatives to override the President's veto. The reason we do so is that we feel the Congress, representing the American people, should have knowledge of what happens in those departments.

Back in 1942 and 1943 an agreement was entered into by the old Committee on Naval Affairs with the Administration and with the then Secretary of the Navy Knox, whereby all acquisitions of real estate of every character and all leases would be submitted to the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. That understanding continued for 2 years. Then when the House Naval Affairs Committee was preparing a public works bill, we wrote a provision into the law carrying out that agreement that existed between President Roosevelt's administration, Secretary Knox, and the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate. Here is what that says:

Provided further, That prior to the acquisition or disposal, by lease or otherwise, of any land acquired for naval use under the authority of this, or any other act, the Secretary of the Navy shall come into agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the terms of such prospective acquisitions or disposals; and recital of compliance with this proviso in any instrument of conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this or any other act shall be conclusive evidence of the Secretary's compliance with this proviso as to the property conveyed.

That has been on the statute books since April 4, 1944. When the Armed Services Committee was created by the merging of the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee, all laws applicable to the Navy fell within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees. So since that time, since the Eightieth Congress, the Armed Services Committees have been administering for the Navy this law that was passed in 1944.

What this bill, House bill 3096, does is merely to extend that same principle to the Army and to the Air Force, because the present provision only extends to the Navy. We now say that we want to include this same principle, with some modifications. Any purchase of realty or any lease under $10,000 does not have to be submitted for the consideration of the committees.

The committee held a hearing on House bill 3096. It was unanimously passed by the committee. I appeared before the Rules Committee and obtained a rule, and the bill was unanimously passed by the House.

At the very time we were debating the bill, the Senate took up a companion bill dealing with the identical subject, which bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, and the same bill with the exception of only one word, was passed by the Senate. So when the House bill reached the Senate, the Senate adopted the House bill.

Now the President has written a veto and he says this is bad legislation. He says it will involve a delay. I disagree with the President in regard to that. I also disagree that it will involve a large personnel to administer it in the Department. In the Navy Department today,

there are only seven men who handle this matter that comes before the committees and House bill 3096 will require only four, a reduction of three. We process in the neighborhood of some 75 or 100 Navy requests nearly every month. We have a member of our staff and we have a special subcommittee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], and including the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and myself. We pass on these various items that come in and we promptly give consideration to them and notify the Department.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the question of delay, it has been my observation that experience is a pretty good teacher. The gentleman has indicated that this process has been in operation with respect to the Navy for nearly 10 years?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct, 2 years by agreement and 7 by law.

Mr. COLE of New York. My question is, Does the gentleman know of a single instance with respect to the Navy where the Navy has been occasioned any delay whatsoever?

Mr. VINSON. I do not, unless there was good reason for the delay. As a matter of fact, there is no request at the White House from the Navy Department for a veto of this measure.

I may say further that there was no objection from the Department of Justice as to the constitutionality of this question of veto.

The Congress has the right to delegate either to a department or a bureau chief authority to carry out any provisions of law in reference to the acquisition of property or the making of leases.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that this practice of having the committee check up on these bids has saved the country untold millions of dollars?

Mr. VINSON. There is no question about it. You may be saving money by cutting down this appropriation and that appropriation, but this bill is where you can save millions of dollars, and that is what the Naval Affairs Committee did in years gone by.

Let us go one step further; the Army, during the last war, had the authority to go out, and it has the authority to do it today, and lease any hotel in the United States that it may see fit to lease. You might pick up the paper tomorrow morning and find where the Army, if it saw fit to do so, had taken over the Statler Hotel. What would be your responsibility? Your responsibility as it stands today would be merely to foot the bill, and you would have no voice in the acquisition.

During the last war it became so bad that the Truman committee in the Senate made an investigation of the leasing of the hotels on Miami Beach and other cities by the Army and Navy and wrote its report. Let me read you what Senator Truman said; here is what the distinguished President said back in 1944:

> The manner in which the hotel acquisition program was carried out resulted in many injustices which the War Department has shown little inclination to prevent. Some of these doubtless could be corrected by simple negotiation, particularly where final settlements have not yet been made. To correct others, the War Department may need further legal authority. The War Department should review the entire situation in detail and report to the proper legislative committees of the Congress.

Now, listen to this:

> It should be pointed out that the Navy Department advises the legislative committees of its real estate acquisitions in advance and keeps these committees advised of its situation.

That is all this bill proposes to do; it merely proposes that when the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force desire to obtain a piece of property that they lay the facts before the two committees.

We had a hearing. General Pick, the Chief of Engineers, was there, representing the Department of Defense. When we first drafted the bill he said the bill would cause them too much trouble and too much delay; so we said to him: "General, you can write the bill to suit yourself." He wrote the bill exempting rivers and harbors and flood control projects, and exempting leases on agricultural grazing permits. The balance of the bill he wrote—of course he is against it because all departmental officials are against Congress knowing what goes on. Let me read you what the general said as the reason why he was opposed to it: "Because you would have to be more cautious. Would you not?" "Absolutely," replied General Pick. They would have to make out a case; and he said that was the reason, that they would have to be more cautious in real-estate transactions. Under the law today a commander of the Army in San Francisco may look out and say: "I want this building." He sends a notice to the Department in Washington and the Department says, "Take that building," and you have no voice in the matter, you know nothing about it until you read of it in the newspapers. They can say, with reference to any property in America, that they will lease it, and they can go one step further; they can acquire property for a manufacturing enterprise for the Department without ever submitting it to the Congress.

Let me show you what is happening right now. The Navy, in compliance with that request—and I will show you how these things happen—a few days ago said, and here is one of them that comes in now:

> The Department of the Navy is initiating action to enter into a supply contract with the Hudson Motor Car Co. for the manufacture of aircraft engines to support the accelerated aircraft-production program. In order that the Hudson Motor Car Co. can produce the engines, additional Government-owned facilities such as land, buildings, building equipment, test cells, and machine tools are required.
>
> The Bureau of Aeronautics proposes to construct the new plant, estimated cost of which is $30,000,000, on a site to be acquired by the Department of the Navy.

They then describe the site and state how much the appraised value is. When that reached the Armed Services Committee we said, "Let us have a little investigation of this." What happened? As a result of investigation the Navy made a further survey and withdrew the proposition to spend $30,000,000 to build a new plant at Detroit for the Hudson Automobile Co. because they found facilities in which they could carry on this work. Every day that same thing goes on.

All I am asking the Congress to do is to exercise the authority that the people have a right to expect of you to know what goes on when your public money is being spent. There is absolutely no unjustified delay. It will not cause any personnel difficulties anywhere down here in the departments. The Navy is doing it today with seven people and can do it under this bill with only four. Of course, the Army will have a little bit larger staff because the Army sometimes is not as cautious in the use of manpower as the other services are. But, nevertheless, it will require only a small group to administer this. It will be submitted to the committee and the committee will make an investigation.

That is what you are here for. If any man in this House that is sent here to exercise this responsibility will go back home and tell your people that you are sent to Washington only to appropriate money that the Department of Defense wants and you know nothing about it until the time comes to foot the bill, I guarantee if you make that kind of a statement they will send a man with a little more inquisitive mind to Washington.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the distinguished gentleman from Georgia care to comment upon the President's statement or his contention that by this legislation we would be trespassing upon the prerogatives of the executive department?

Mr. VINSON. Here is a brief covering that identical point. You do not trespass. You delegate to a bureau to do certain things. Now we are saying by law that instead of delegating it to the bureau, delegate it to yourself, delegate it to a committee here in Congress. That is all we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, last December we had up for consideration a military public-works bill involving the expenditure of $1,658,000,000 to acquire property all over the United States. I may say to the House that another bill will be up for consideration in a few days to spend $6,000,000,000 or more for military public works. We wrote a provision in that public-works bill that any real estate acquired under that bill or any other bill could not be disposed of except by a specific act of the Congress.

Now, the President had to sign the bill, but he wrote a message and he said, "I am opposed to section 407 of the bill because I do not want to require these departments to get an act of Congress when they dispose of real estate."

Let me go one step further. If we had had something like this on the statute books with reference to personal property, with reference to clothes, with reference to shoes, with reference to tanks and with reference to other equipment, we would not today be as short as we are, because one reason you are not putting today more men in the army, in your navy, and in your air force, is due to the fact that you do not have the equipment. They disposed of it because Congress had no control of it. Now, I have been here a long time, and I have been fighting during those years that I have been here for Congress to meet its responsibility and not delegate, every day of the week, more and more authority to the Executive.

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

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

Mr. DURHAM. At the present time many Navy leases are coming before the committee, amounting to many millions of dollars. We can say, "We interpose no objection," or disapprove the project.

Mr. VINSON. If we find one that is coming in like this Detroit plant, involving some $30,000,000, why we stop it and look into it. I say to this House that this is a forward step in restoring to Congress its responsibility. It is the people's money that you are spending, and why should you sit idly by here when the only knowledge you have of the acquisition of a piece of property is to hear it on Sunday night from Walter Winchell or from Drew Pearson? Let us know about these things and know about them in advance.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman from Georgia elaborate on his statement that the President did sign a public-works bill which included some of the same provisions of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. That bill, Public Law 910, did not include the exact provisions. We put a provision, section 407, into that public-works bill that none of the property heretofore acquired or hereafter acquired by the military departments could be disposed of until the Congress passed a specific act, and we are on sound ground in passing legislation of that kind. Why should we permit the Department of Defense, whenever it makes up its mind, to sell this piece of property or sell that piece of property? It is Government property, and Congress should have some control over Government property.

Mr. HÉBERT. I have reference to the bill that the gentleman from Georgia referred to in connection with carrying out the informal agreement which the old Committee on Naval Affairs entered into.

Mr. VINSON. That was approved by the President back in 1944—Public Law 289, Seventy-eighth Congress. I repeat, the Navy has been doing it for 7 years, by statute, and I am merely asking the Congress to extend it to the Air Force and to the Army, and if you do so, you will not read in the paper where they have leased this building or that building. Let me tell you what we did recently.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. This bill very clearly says that none of the defense departments may acquire or dispose of any property without the agreement in advance of the Committee on Armed Services. That means that the Committee on Armed Services of the Congress must administer this law. What I would like to know is, When has the Constitution of the United States been changed so as to give this Congress the right to administer the laws that it enacts?

Mr. VINSON. If you will just merely read this brief you will find that Congress has, by the Constitution, the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States. That is the Constitution itself, and instead of saying it should be administered by the Department of Defense, Congress has the right to put in limitations on any piece of property or any method by which a piece of property may be acquired, and we say we put this responsibility on ourselves by saying to the Armed Services Committees, "You must have knowledge of it before it can be acquired."

Mr. MULTER. Your rule and regulation that you attempt to write into this bill is more than asking for the power.

Mr. VINSON. Not a bit in the world. Of course, I know what the gentleman has in mind. I know there is a little objection on the part of the Expenditures Committee. The Expenditures Committee think they have jurisdiction of this matter. They think they ought to do this. They are not going to the principle. Now, we know how to do it. We know how to hold the feet to the fire. We know well enough when they have a case from a national defense standpoint. If they do have one, there is no hesitation. Yesterday the whole committee approved some 50 or 60 of them, and they approve them every day. But every one of them is read, every one of them is briefed by our staff. We have a staff member that is paid $10,000 of the taxpayers' money, and his time is devoted to this. In years gone by a former Member of Congress did all this for the Committee on Naval Affairs.

If you want to do something constructive, if you want to know what goes on, if you want to know what happens in the departments, pass this over the President's veto.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the last 8 or 10 years, how many applications has the committee refused the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. We have rejected many. Now they go out and make their surveys and do just exactly as they did in this Detroit case. Take this Detroit instance. If it had not been for Public Law 289 the Navy Department would have made an expenditure of $30,000,000. They would have been building the plant today. But as a result of the committee's stepping in to look it over, the Navy made a survey and found other buildings, and therefore did not have to spend the $30,000,000.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. All of us realize that it is the province, duty, obligation, and responsibility of the Congress to provide for the common defense of this country. But, providing for the common defense has nothing to do with this legislation; if it did, I would be one hundred percent for its immediate adoption, because I sincerely feel that the Congress has been derelict in its responsibilities to provide for the common defense in compliance with section 8, article IV of our Constitution. To the contrary, many Members of Congress daily take pride in criticizing others for the very things the Congress has or has not done. I say that the prime reason for our present predicament in foreign affairs has been the failure of the Congress to assume its duties and responsibilities to provide for the common defense, rather than passively allow the administration to dictate such policies.

Often we hear from the floor of the House a Member say that we are not fighting communism, but that we are only fighting imperialistic actions of Russia. Of course, those statements are to justify this Congress in supporting communism on one hand while fighting communism on the other. Communism is communism whether in Russia or elsewhere. All Communists are imperialistically inclined in their beliefs. This Congress has had the opportunity on a number of occasions to do something about that for which they daily criticize others.

A majority has given money to Yugoslavia, a Communist government, to encourage them in their communistic beliefs—buying with our wealth while Russia takes through infiltration. The majority of the Congress has helped bring about the situation that we are now criticizing, and still we say that it is not our fault—that it is solely the fault of others. There are many Members in Congress who are so administration minded that they would stay with the administration on any issue—right or wrong. Those gentlemen will do anything that the President tells them to do. Many other Members, while biased and prejudiced against the administration, will sidestep any efforts in Congress to correct any detrimental situation in order to keep the turmoil alive for use in the elections in 1952.

There are not enough individual-thinking Members of this Congress to get a lot done for the better welfare of our people. Many of the same Members of Congress who are now daily criticizing Dean Acheson voted to install General Marshall as Secretary of Defense.

I have never found cause to regret having protested and fought against the installation of General Marshall; he and Acheson have the same mind. Both are failures, and it will be my pleasure to assume my portion of the responsibility in efforts to remove either or both of these misfits.

This proposed legislation is intended to allow the Congress the opportunity to administer its own legislation. I have thought since childhood that we were to maintain three separate and distinct departments of Government. Not so under the terms of this proposal, because here it is suggested that the Congress legislate the laws, rules, and regulations governing the various agencies of the Department of Defense, and then in turn administer those laws, rules, and regulations.

It is often that we criticize the administration for attempting to dictate legislation. Too, we frequently hear the Supreme Court criticized for writing legislation. Now, the Congress comes along and suggests that we delegate the authority to a portion of this House—the Armed Services Committee—to legislate, administer, and adjudicate all functions of our military forces. This is a violation of a basic principle—establishing a drastic precedent—and could well lead to abolition of our system of government. This proposal is no more drastic than a proposal to allow the Judiciary Committee of the House to determine the decision of a Federal judge; the Banking and Currency Committee of the House to pass upon all Federal Bank loans; or the Agriculture Committee of the House to pass upon all individual PMA payments. This precedent establishes no end to its possibilities.

This proposal is popular for the simple reason that the present administration is unpopular—which is a poor criterion for future effects. Of course, every committee of this Congress should assume its authority to investigate all Government departments and agencies coming within the purview and jurisdiction of the committee; but that does not mean that the committee should have the authority to administer congressional legislation. Even if the Congress were constitutionally authorized by law or principle to administer congressional legislation, I still cannot believe that one committee of this Congress should be delegated the authority to make such vital decisions for all of the other Members of Congress.

At least the Armed Services Committee, the Expenditures Committee, and the Appropriations Committee have the authority and should investigate all activities of our military departments. These investigations would reveal any wrongful expenditure of moneys and would afford this Congress an opportunity to prohibit any excessive spending by any of these defense agencies. This could and should be accomplished without changing the basic principles of our constitutional system of government.

I will appreciate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] addressing himself upon the subject of whether this legislation does not authorize the Congress to administer its own laws.

Mr. VINSON. Go one step further. If the gentleman from Arkansas will merely examine the rules of the House, he will find that by one rule of the House, which is a law, it is the duty not only of the Committee on Armed Services but of every committee of the Congress to see, to supervise, and to watch over the administration of every law that comes from that committee. That is all we are trying to do here.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] admits by his argument that the Congress is only authorized to investigate activities of our defense agencies. By this proposal the Congress is not investigating, but is permitting a committee of the Congress to administer the very laws that this Congress adopts. Of course, it is the duty of the Armed Services Committee to investigate activties of the defense agencies and to closely observe any spendthrift tendencies by any of those agencies so as to provide legislation and curtail appropriations to preclude any misuse of Government properties or moneys. That is not what this bill provides; it gives authority to the Armed Services Committee to supervise the purchasing and selling of property by the defense agencies—to administer their activities—and to veto any purchase or sale of property that does not meet with the approval of the Armed Services Committee. This is nothing short of providing that a committee of this Congress may administer all laws adopted by the Congress affecting defense agencies. The gentleman from Georgia and many other proponents of this legislation would strongly protest any similar request by another committee of this Congress.

Mr. VINSON. The Congress always has authority to say how property shall be acquired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I inquire of the gentleman if it is his impression that the operation of this system with reference to the Navy concurs with my own recollection, that at the very beginning of it, 10 years ago, the Navy resented it and chafed under it, they did not like it at all, and since they began to operate under it and have seen how the committee has dealt with these problems, they now not only accept it but welcome it, and are happy to have it and to share their responsibility with the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Let me go one step further. There was no scandal in connection with the leasing of any property or the acquisition of any property by the Navy. There was nothing in the Navy transactions that prompted what Senator Truman wrote about the Army hotel acquisition at Miami Beach and other cities. The reason is the scrutiny that these committees have over all these transactions.

We do not want this work but we have to do one of two things: We should do a complete job or wash our hands of it. We cannot do it half way. We do not want Members of Congress to come into the House and say, "What about this hotel and that hotel?" unless you place us in position to know about it. What we are asking today is that you put us in a position so that we can do a complete job.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the membership of the House and I believe the country at large should know this, that due to his faithfulness, diligence, and alertness, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has saved the taxpayers of this Nation hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEMENTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I point out to the House that the Committee on Rules in giving certain authority by resolution to the Committee on Armed Services did so with the distinct understanding and certainly with the thought in mind that that great committee would ride herd on the expenditures for which we have voted so many billions of dollars. I am sure that many of those appropriations would not have been passed or approved so easily had we not had the understanding and impression that the Committee on Armed Services would be permitted to function as the Congress desires.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in corroborating the point of my distinguished chairman, I would like to read from the House Rules and Manual, Eighty-second Congress, page 474, section 136:

> Legislative oversight by standing committees.

I will read the first three lines:

> To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws—

Mr. Speaker, in directing my remarks to the President's veto message and the reconsideration of H. R. 3096 I wish to call to the attention of the House the importance and need for this legislation in the interests of economy and efficiency. I should like to call to the attention of the Members the hearing which I conducted as chairman of subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee with the assistance of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] relating to the proposal of the General Services Administration to lease two modern apartment houses in this city, the Boston House and the State House, for the Department of Defense. This is a perfect example of the type of real-estate transaction that this legislation will bring to light. The committee heard

testimony that the two apartment buildings were constructed under the provisions of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. That is, the funds for the construction of the buildings were obtained under mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration at 90 percent of the costs of the projects.

The GSA, which is responsible for leasing space for all Government activities in the District of Columbia, offered to lease these buildings for office space for the Defense Department. But apparently the FHA foresaw a legal obstacle that would cause embarrassment unless steps were taken to avoid it. The apartment buildings were built under legislation designed to relieve the critical shortage of veterans' housing in this area.

Therefore, the FHA advised the GSA that it could not consent to the conversion of these buildings from housing projects to office buildings unless the GSA indicated that they would institute appropriate condemnation proceedings to achieve their objective. In the absence of such a threat, the FHA felt that it would not have authority to permit the conversion and at the same time insure the mortgages under the provisions of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. On the other hand, if the GSA did condemn the buildings, it was decided that GSA would have to assume the mortgage commitments. This did not appear to be a desirable situation. Subsequently all hands agreed that the mere threat of condemnation would be of sufficient importance to relieve the FHA of its obligations under its statute. The GSA, in a letter to the FHA, furnished the threat and thus the legal obstacles were cleared.

But the owners of the apartment buildings and the Government now had to come to agreement concerning the amount of rent that would be charged. After considerable negotiations the owner of the State House submitted a letter offer to lease his building to the Government for $400,000 per year. This owner in filing his application with FHA for mortgage insurance and for the establishment of rental ceiling stated under oath that based upon his experience in renting apartments the State House would not be filled to capacity all of the time. He estimated that 7 percent of the time the apartments would be vacant. Therefore, in establishing rental ceilings, he requested the FHA to compute his gross income on the basis of 93 percent occupancy. The FHA agreed and based upon 93 percent occupancy that Federal agency established rent ceilings authorizing the owner to charge a maximum rent of $353,500 per year for this building.

With the building being used for residential housing the FHA estimated that the owner would incur expenses of liability insurance, salaries of elevator operators, maintenance men, legal and real-estate agent fees, and furnish utilities, light, gas, heat, and so forth and similar expenses with which the owner of any apartment building is confronted. It was estimated that these expenses would run about $97,000 a year. But the income of $353,500 would still allow the owner a reasonable profit on his investment.

Notwithstanding the rent ceilings thus established and the FHA's calculations of reasonable profit to the owner, the GSA proposed to pay this owner $400.000 a year and at the same time, operate and maintain the building, relieving him of all the expenses that he would have had to incur, had he rented the building for veterans' housing. Furthermore, at the expiration of the lease the Government would have had to restore the apartment building to its former condition. Here is a case where one agency of the Government proposed to lease a building, the construction of which was sponsored by another agency of the Government. The first agency entered into negotiations to pay the owner an annual rental which exceeded the ceiling established by the second agency, and furthermore, proposed to relieve the owner of all of his operating expenses. In this instance, he would have received approximately $47,000 a year more in rent and would have saved an additional $97,000 in expenses, or a total of $144,000 per annum.

Similarly, the FHA established price ceilings on the apartments in the Boston house which would have permitted the owner to receive a gross income of approximately $300,000 from rent based upon 93 percent occupancy. Again, with this maximum rent ceiling, it was estimated that the owner would incur expenses of $94,000 in operating the building. To this owner, the Government proposed to pay an annual rent of $320,000 and to relieve him of all of the maintenance and operating expenses. In this case, the owner would have made approximately $20,000 a year more in rent, by having the Government as a tenant, and would have saved $94,000 in expenses, or a total of $114,000 per year.

These violations were brought out as a result of an investigation and hearings that were held by the Armed Services Committee, which resulted in a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense that further negotiations for the leasing of these buildings were not in public interest. Still we have no statutory authority to prohibit real-estate transactions of this nature. In this instance, the Secretary of Defense followed the recommendations of the committee. Testimony revealed that there was no need for the apartments. Subcommittee was advised that the original estimates of the Defense Department to recruit 17,325 employees by June 30, 1951, have been reduced considerably. Furthermore, the GSA advised that space utilization by nondefense agencies was not as efficient as that of the Defense Department and that every effort was being made to compress the nondefense agencies into smaller quarters thereby releasing additional space for the Defense Department.

But there is further evidence of chicanery indulged in by the executive agency. The owners of these apartment buildings after agreeing to a rental price, were instructed by the GSA to submit to the Government offers to rent their apartment buildings. The offers were dated January 18, 1951. With these offers in hand, the GSA ran an advertisement in the Evening Star on February 1.

In response to questioning by members of the committee, it was testified that in an endeavor to find additional office space, advertisements were placed in the newspaper and that these two apartment owners were the only two that responded. Further testimony was that the rents were determined by the bids received, but the truth of the matter is that negotiations were carried on with the owners for months prior to the advertisement being run in the newspaper. The ads were just window dressing. It is sleight of hand such as this that causes the Members of Congress to feel that there is a definite need to review those real-estate transactions which involve large expenditures of public funds.

The enactment of the legislation that the Congress is now considering will make these transactions highly improbable if not impossible. The committees of the Congress will be advised beforehand of the proposals to acquire real estate.

While the GSA was proposing to spend approximately three-fourths of a million dollars a year for the rental of luxury apartment buildings for office space, the Armed Services Committee made a survey of the space in the Pentagon Building. That survey revealed that there was over 125,000 square feet of space on the concourse, and that a large segment of that space was occupied by such commercial establishments as the florist shop, the jewelry shop, the drug store, the dry-cleaning store, the book store, the household appliance store, the dress shop, and the shoe-repair shop.

It seems to me that the officials charged with good space utilization should examine into the propriety of housing commercial establishments in space that might be converted to office space, while at the same time proposing to spend millions of dollars for the conversion of luxury-apartment building.

Further evidence that this legislation is needed is found in the fact that here in Washington, D. C., the tendency is to lease buildings for exceptionally long terms. Of the 61 buildings being leased for Government office and warehouse space as of June 30, 1950, only six of them have been leased for a period of less than 4 years and 55 have been in effect for a period longer than 5 years. Ten of the leases have been in effect for 25 years and one of them, it was testified, has been under Government lease for 42 years. With such legislation as this on the books, these conditions would not exist.

There is nothing new in this legislation. As has been pointed out by the chairman, the Navy Department reported to committees of Congress during World War II and still does.

I understand that even prior to the enactment of legislation requiring the Navy Department to report these proposals, the Secretary of the Navy voluntarily submitted this information to the

committees for consideration and approval. Furthermore, General Pick, chief of Army engineers, in testifying before the Armed Services Committee indicated that the submissions would in no way impede the defense effort and that he would be able to comply without interfering in the slightest with his operation. For he wrote the bill.

Another example of this type legislation is Public Law No. 3, approved by the Eighty-second Congress on March 10, 1951. That law directed that the Navy Department be prohibited from selling, transferring, or otherwise disposing of any of its vessels without prior authorization by the Congress. In view of the complete satisfaction that we have had in handling the Navy projects and further in view of the real-estate transactions of the type I have just described, and in view of the legislative oversight by standing committees I strongly recommend that the House go on record in favor of overriding the President's veto and extend to the Army and Air Force that same authority as the committee now holds with respect to the Navy Department.

General Services Administration—Public Buildings Service, Region 3

Leases active on—	Number of buildings leased for—									
	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 to 9 years	10 to 14 years	15 to 19 years	20 to 24 years	25 years or more	Total
June 30, 1945	13	13	31	43	78	35	1	0	10	224
June 30, 1950	3	0	1	2	18	19	8	0	10	61

Remarks: In accordance with the reorganization plan of 1939 a number of leases formerly held by other departments were transferred to the Public Buildings Administration. Some of these transferred lease files do not have complete records of the Government's occupancy prior to the lease transfer. Accordingly, this report indicates that the Government originally leased the buildings in the year first shown in our lease files, or other records. There is, however, a possibility that the Government may have re-leased the building and then reentered at some later date.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not true that the $114,000 is just an annual saving? It goes on each year?

Mr. CLEMENTE. That is right. That is for each year.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEATING. Another precedent which we have adopted has to do with the Internal Revenue law, where we have provided that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue shall review any tax revision over $200,000. I think that is an exact parallel to our present situation.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I well know the danger of a freshman Member crossing swords with the most expert swordsman in the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], but I believe there is another side to this story, and I hope the gentleman from Georgia will give more than 5 minutes so that the other side may be told to the Members of the House. A Presidential veto is not a thing lightly undertaken and there must be some good reason for the veto. I should like to call to your attention a few facts which seem to me to indicate that it would be wise to sustain the President's veto.

On December 20, when very few Members of the House were present, the Military Property Act was brought to this floor; and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Texas, who is also a distinguished and skilled speaker, advocated the passage of that act. That act contained section 407, and that is the subject of this legislation which is before us today. H. R. 3096 was a so-called attempt to repeal section 407. At that time the Committee on the Armed Services made just as skilled a presentation of section 407, and I will tell you what section 407 of that act required: It required that the Defense Department submit to the Congress any proposition to sell or acquire land and that Congress pass on it.

The Committee on the Armed Services passed an act which would require the administrators of personal and real property to come before the Congress and get a law passed before they could sell or dispose of, or transfer property; that is what they did, and the President a month or so later rightly asked that that section be repealed because it would make completely inoperative the function of taking care of the Federal property of this Government.

In place of coming before the House and repealing section 407 they come before you with another bill, a bill which does quite a few things. This bill, H. R. 3096, which incidentally was also passed at a time when very few Members were here—and I might say that section 407 in the original property act was not approved by the Budget Bureau or the Department of Defense; and I might say further that the Department of Defense has asked that H. R. 3096 be vetoed for good and sufficient reasons.

This bill provides that none of the defense departments can lease a building at an annual rent over $10,000 without coming to the Congress and getting permission to do so. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] just said a moment ago that from 40 to 50 of these leases and propositions to acquire property are coming before their subcommittee from the Navy alone, and the gentleman from Georgia said that they had one man assigned to review the 40 or 50 leases a day that come before them from the Navy. I ask: What kind of supervision can one man give to 40 or 50 leases from the Navy alone? And now you are going to bring the Army and the Air Force into this picture, and you are going to allow the administrative committee of this House to be the administrative bureau for the billions and billions of dollars worth of property that are in the Defense Establishment. With the addition of the Army and the Air Force to the Navy responsibilities, I can assure you that the Armed Services Committee will find itself completely unable to fulfill the obligations it seeks to impose on itself in H. R. 3096.

There is a clear line of demarcation between legislating a law and administering it, and I am saying that the President, if you will read his message in the May 15 issue, gave good and sufficient reasons why, from the standpoint of administering the property of the Government, H. R. 3096 would prove completely unworkable.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the 2 minutes. In connection with the leasing of property, the Defense Departments cannot sign a lease, they cannot engage in the transfer of personal property or real property between agencies or from the agencies to cities and States. A lot of that has been done under the Surplus Property Act. Many of your States and cities have acquired military property by transfer under the clause in the Surplus Property Act. But now that cannot be done without going to Mr. VINSON's committee. I say to you that the complete staff of the Committee on Armed Services could not possibly furnish at the present time the personnel to go over all of these matters, even if they used all of their people, and, in my opinion, they have many things that are far more important than this.

This is in direct contradiction to the Property Act of 1949, the Federal Property and Administrative Act, which placed in one central agency, the General Services Administration, responsibility for preserving Government property, for disposing of Government property, for leasing property, and by that act alone, which was in complete accord with the Hoover Commission report and which passed unanimously in this House, we have eliminated bidding for leases and the bidding for property between the Defense Departments. The General Services Administration is procuring property and leasing property for all Federal agencies now and saving millions and millions of dollars. It is true there have been some mistakes made, but I assure you, when it comes to waste, the military and all of its departments have plenty of areas of waste which the gentleman's committee could concern itself with, without interfering with the property law which was passed unanimously by this Congress. Public Law 152 placed the responsibility for purchasing property, disposing of property, and leasing property for all the agencies of Government in one responsible head. That responsible head, Mr. Larsen, of General Services, can be called at any time before the Armed Services Committee or any other committee of the House to explain its action.

Mr. Speaker, I am frank to say that I urged upon the President the veto of

H. R. 3096. On May 10, I wrote to the President as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I take this means of urging upon you the veto of H. R. 3096, recently passed by the Congress?

Although this bill would repeal section 407 of Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, in accordance with your message to the Congress of January 15, 1951, other provisions are included in the bill which do not comport with an orderly and efficient program of Government property acquisition, utilization, and disposition. It was clearly the objective of the Congress, in enacting Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, to vest in the General Services Administrator over-all responsibility for the handling of Federal property. Neither section 407 of Public Law 910, nor H. R. 3096 conform to that general objective. These proposals would serve only to obscure the responsibility of the General Services Administrator and to interpose cumbersome and unworkable procedures in Federal property management.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, pages 5374–5375, contains the President's veto message on H. R. 3096. This message points out that the requirements in the bill to secure agreement from the Armed Services Committees of both Houses on all major real estate and leasing transactions of the Department of Defense and the Civilian Defense Administration would impose a heavy and unnecessary burden on the Department of Defense. Numerous personnel that should be working on vital military tasks would be diverted to the preparation of hundreds of reports for submission to the Armed Services Committees. The delays involved in this kind of procedure would impede the defense-procurement program.

The President pointed out that the resulting delays would be not only those involved in the actual preparation of the reports required, their presentation to the congressional committees, and the review of those reports by the committees and their staffs, but greater and more serious delays resulting from the inability of the Department of Defense to plan future operations until after the congressional committees had acted.

It appears to me that this legislation embodies a major fallacy of administration; it violates the proper division of labor and allocation of responsibilities between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. The surest way to destroy responsibility and accountability in the administration is to make a committee of Congress a party to each and every administrative act of any importance, such as this bill does.

I recognize, of course, as do other Members, that the real estate and leasing transactions of the military and other departments of the Government, are not always above reproach. The Congress or any appropriate committee of the Congress is entitled to criticize any or all of these transactions. It is entitled to get full information; but it is not entitled, in my humble judgment, to sit as a party in the making of the transaction. This is a basic violation of those tenets of government to which we have tried to adhere through the years.

Legislative policy is expressed in the laws that we pass. The execution of the laws, the administrative detail designed to implement these laws, rests upon the executive branch. No executive agency can be held fully accountable unless it has full responsibility for execution of the law. If the Armed Services Committee is going to take the responsibility for approving the purchase of every tract of land acquired by the military, or every office building or warehouse leased, then it seems to me that the committee has gone too far afield from its congressional duties.

Furthermore, the duties imposed upon the Armed Services Committee by this bill are duties properly vested in the General Services Administrator and other Government officials by Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress. Under Reorganization Plan 18 of 1950, the General Services Administration is responsible for acquiring general-purpose space in many cities throughout the United States. As the President pointed out in his veto message, in such cases the military departments submit their needs to the General Services Administration which acquires or leases space on behalf of the military department concerned. If H. R. 3096 were the law, presumably the General Services Administration would first have to determine the availability of space in a particular transaction; the military department would have to run up to the Hill with the proposal; the committees and their staffs would have to review the proposal, and agree to it; the military department would have to take it back to the General Services Administration; and by that time probably, the space would be gone.

I see nothing of good administration in the enactment of H. R. 3096. The broad objective of Congress in enacting Public Law 152 and creating the General Services Administration was to work toward the orderly management of Federal property, to work toward a more efficient handling of Federal property under central and responsible supervision. H. R. 3096 is a long step away from this objecive. It purports to vest in the Armed Services Committee certain management responsibilities which should rest on the General Services Administrator.

The report of the committee—House Report 292—on H. R. 3096 is very frank in stating that this bill has not been approved by the Department of Defense. It has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is not in accord with the program of the President. At this time of national emergency, no good purpose is served by injecting committees of the Congress into the middle of the administrative actions necessary to facilitate the national defense program.

Make no mistake about it, I favor the most searching scrutiny and surveillance of this program by the Congress and its appropriate committees. I am honored, myself, to serve on one such committee, the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, with the important duty of overseeing activities in the executive branch. I wish to commend the Committee on Armed Services and its distinguished chairman for the excellent work they have done in keeping the military departments in line. My only concern, and I wish to emphasize it again, is that a clear distinction must be made between these functions of Congressional scrutiny and surveilance and the functions of administration, which latter belong to the executive branch.

Let it be noted that H. R. 3096 not only interferes with the duties and responsibilities of the General Services Administrator regarding the leasing of space for the military departments and the civilian defense administration, it would also disrupt the whole program of surplus property disposal. One military department could not even transfer a piece of land to another military department without getting an O. K. from the committee.

Declarations of surplus to the General Services Administration could not be effected without the approval of the committee.

I hope the President's veto will be upheld.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

THE LEGISLATURE ENACTS, THE EXECUTIVE ENFORCES, AND THE JUDICIARY INTERPRETS THE LAWS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am jealous of the prerogatives of this House; at the same time, I do not want this House to exercise or attempt to exercise any prerogatives of the executive department. I was taught in school that the legislative body enacted laws, the executive branch of the Government enforced them, and that the judiciary interpreted the laws. If this proposal goes over into enforcing the laws, I am going to vote against it because I do not believe we should get into the executive branch of the Government any more than the executive branch of the Government should get into the legislative branch.

PRECEDENT MORE IMPORTANT THAN THIS BILL

This particular bill is not so important as the precedent it sets and, also, may I invite your attention to the fact that this is an enlargement upon another precedent. That precedent, I think, was a bad one, but this is an enlargement upon that. So where will we stop in enlarging on these bad precedents?

The Banking and Currency Committee has a "watchdog committee," both in the House and Senate. We are overseeing the enforcement of the Defense Production Act that we passed, but we have no veto power. They do not have to consult us about the orders they issue. If we should carry this proposal to its logical conclusion, to its logical end, the "watchdog committee" should have the power to say that they cannot issue any kind of an order until it is submitted to our committee and the committee's approval obtained. That is going rather far.

Take the Committee on Agriculture: it oversees a lot of important functions. Are you going to let that committee have the same veto power this committee will have? I am referring to this committee as at present constituted. I am not criticising any of its members. I have a very high regard for the chairman and for all members of the Armed Services Committee. But I am thinking about

our constitutional form of government in the hope that we will not get the legislative into the executive branch of the Government. Suppose the Committee on Banking and Currency should say in connection with a loan from the International Bank—we passed that law; at least, we sponsored it—"We think every loan that is proposed by the International Bank providing for over, say, $100,000,000, should receive the approval of our committee first." That just shows the extreme that we could go just in that one committee.

Now, a committee is an agency of the House, and here we are delegating to the Armed Services Committee the power to act for the House. I heard the Detroit deal mentioned a while ago. It must be a sordid proposition of some kind, and I am assuming it is, and I am assuming something was wrong, but suppose that was submitted to this committee, should they pass on it for the entire 435 Members? On other deals like that there might be a difference of opinion and that the duly elected Members of the House should have a voice in it. Why leave it up to an agency of the House? Why not require the committee to submit it to the whole House of Representatives and get their approval and then let every Member who was elected from the 435 districts at least have an opportunity to be heard in support of or in opposition to it? Now, if the Committee on Armed Services can save money, all right, and I am sure that they can in many instances, overseeing the expenditure of funds, and I am all for that, but could we not enact laws to place limitations and restrictions upon these deals and punish the people who are guilty of violating these laws and have a better result than trying to administer them. And, if we are going to put it on the basis that the committee might save money, what about the Committee on Agriculture saving money in the administration of the funds that they make possible through their authorization in legislation? What about the Committee on Banking and Currency? What about the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? Should the Committee on the Judiciary in the future, if this precedent is enlarged upon, have to be consulted by the Department of Justice before it can bring antitrust suits under certain conditions?

I respectfully submit there is no end to this. So, we have a precedent in 1944, which I think was a bad precedent, and now we are attempting here to enlarge upon that bad precedent. I do not think we should do it. I am going to vote to sustain the President's veto. That is just my own opinion; just one of the 435 Members. I am not criticizing any individual for entertaining an opposite view, but I think this a serious question. Furthermore, our constituents will have a right to think that if we go into the business of seeing how these funds are spent, why should we not be responsible for the expenditure of all of them? We are taking upon ourselves an obligation which we cannot carry out. We have plenty to do in the legislative branch. We should do our own job better before attempting to run the executive branch. Like it is now the Executive is elected by the people of the United States, he is elected every 4 years. The people voted for him; they elected him. Under the Constitution he is charged with the duty of spending funds that Congress appropriates. We have no strings on the funds under the Constitution, which is right. Are we taking on an additional responsibility which eventually will be burdensome to us, and is this a very dangerous precedent established on an already bad precedent?

Let us consider for a moment how in actual practice the Armed Services Committee will probably pass upon proposed contracts that are submitted to the committee if this veto is overridden:

First. A procurement agency will submit the proposed contract to the Committee on Armed Services of the House by delivery to the chairman of the committee, or to someone acting for the chairman;

Second. The chairman will refer the proposal to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the particular matter involved;

Third. The chairman of the subcommittee will automatically refer it to his staff, who are not Members of Congress but are employees of the subcommittee;

Fourth. Next, the staff will examine the proposal and make a recommendation to the chairman of the subcommittee;

Fifth. The chairman of the subcommittee will doubtless approve the project in 9 out of 10 cases and it will be referred back to the department sending it up, with the committee's approval;

Sixth. In the event there is something about the proposal that needs further investigation, the chairman of the subcommittee will either conduct the investigation himself, or have his staff conduct the investigation, and submit the points in dispute to his subcommittee;

Seventh. The subcommittee will then pass on it and if approved it will be sent back to the department with favorable action indicated;

Eighth. If there should be any controversy in the subcommittee over a proposal and there is a division of vote, the matter will in all probability be referred to the whole committee of 38 members of the Armed Services of the House for consideration and report;

Ninth. At a meeting of the full committee a quorum or a majority of the members must be present;

Tenth. In the event of a controversy before the whole committee of 38 members and there is a close vote, but approval is granted, the matter will then be submitted back to the department with the approval of the committee.

It will be noticed that at no time will the other Members of the House of Representatives, who are elected by their constituents from their respective districts just like the members of the Armed Services Committee, be allowed to express their approval or disapproval of the proposal.

The matter will be handled entirely by the Armed Services Committee which is an agency of the House of Representatives, but under the procedure proposed in asking us to override the President's veto no Member of the House outside of members of this committee will have any voice or authority concerning it.

This procedure is in the direction of leaving important matters to a comparative few Members of the entire body for final decision.

It is possible that the House of Representatives will not always have the same fine committee and such an excellent chairman as it has in this Congress. The powers proposed to be given to the chairman of the subcommittee under this procedure or to the chairman of the whole committee places upon either a great responsibility and burden, and if an evil person should happen to get in either one of these positions in the future great harm to our country could be done.

It occurs to me that there should be some limit to the red tape that Congress should want to impose upon our own Government and governmental affairs, and particularly in the execution of the laws that the Congress passes.

If there is a proposal by a procurement officer submitted to the Armed Services Committee when that committee is in recess who will pass on the matter? Will the chairman of the subcommittee be given the full power to pass on it? Or, will the chairman of the whole committee be given full power to pass upon it? Or, will the staff of the committee be allowed to pass upon the question involved?

It should be remembered that neither the staff of the committee, nor the members of the committee are under obligation to execute the laws. They are not under bond of any kind, and not even under oath to properly administer the funds that Congress has made available.

Let us look at this question from a different angle. The Committee on the Armed Services of the House has no power to appropriate funds; this committee merely reports favorably a bill providing lump-sum authorizations for defense purposes. When such a bill has become a law, the Defense Department in the executive branch of the Government prepares a budget itemizing in much detail how they would like to have the money expended. This request is submitted in the form of a bill, introduced by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and it is referred to the appropriate subcommittee for hearings and report. Before this subcommittee every expenditure is investigated carefully and the whole bill is gone through with a fine-tooth comb, after which a report is made to the full committee, which is usually approved by the whole Committee on Appropriations and the bill comes before the House for consideration. Then, each and every Member of the 435 Members of the House have an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of any part of the bill, and if items have been left out that a Member believes should be inserted, an amendment can be proposed by the Member, including the item and the amount of money to be used for it and all Members of the House allowed to vote on it.

The procedure I have outlined above in the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee in the House

is duplicated in the other body, the United States Senate.

Now we are asked to not only have the appropriations so carefully safeguarded as outlined above, but also to get the approval of the Committee on Armed Services before certain expenditures can be made. And remember again, the committee that will have the power to grant the approval is not the committee of the House of Representatives that makes the appropriation possible. Although this procedure is not intended as a reflection on the Appropriations Committee, it cannot be construed as a compliment.

The Constitution, article I, section 1, contains this language:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Article II, section 1, of the United States Constitution provided:

The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

When Congress passes a law which provides for an expenditure of funds from the United States Treasury, the Executive is charged with the duty of spending that money and is held responsible in every way for its proper and lawful expenditure. If we tie the hands of the President and say the President cannot spend certain funds without the approval of certain committees in the Congress, this will be tying the President's hands and taking at least a part of the responsibility for the expenditure of these particular funds away from the President. The function of a congressional committee in a matter of this kind cannot be construed as a legislative function, because if it is it must be performed by the whole Congress, including both the House and Senate. Such a function cannot be considered an Executive function, because the congressional committee is no part of the executive branch of the Government, and is not included within the constitutional provision that permits it to exercise executive power. What kind of a function is it?

It occurs to me that it is not only good policy but good law under our Constitution for the Congress to hold the President responsible at all times, as the Constitution attempts to hold him responsible, and not have his responsibility divided or his powers restricted or restrained. There are plenty of ways that Congress can have influence over an attempted misuse of public funds without attempting to directly enforce the laws.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice in support of the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. He has already given this House sufficient facts to justify overriding the President's veto. I also heard the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I am in disagreement with the position he has taken, although I do recognize some conflict of jurisdiction as between a legislative oversight affecting the jurisdiction of the expenditures committee in connection with the Federal Property Act and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services in connection with the activities of the Defense Department. Notwithstanding the fact that there may be some duplication of legislative oversight, I do contend that all of these transactions should be given consideration by the committees of Congress, and if there is any avenue of duplication, then that can be worked out later. It in no way mitigates against the wisdom of overriding the President's veto on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, my chairman is more intimately associated with the details of this matter than I am, but every member of the Committee on Armed Services of this House is fully aware of the things that can happen if the authority contained in this bill is not granted. In that connection, I want to point out some aspects of the average military public works bill that comes before our committee.

With the development of the jet aircraft it has become necessary to strengthen and lengthen practically every runway in the United States under the jurisdiction of the Navy and the Air Force. We are right now in the midst of that program, and I want to talk about that some. Large sums have already been appropriated for this purpose, and larger sums still will have to be appropriated in the early future.

As a matter of planning, it is not always possible for the agencies to pinpoint the exact location of a particular air field or the exact piece of property which will be required to extend a runway. In connection with the extension of facilities for jet aircraft, we must remember that it will sometimes be possible and sometimes be necessary to recapture some of the auxiliary fields which we have had previously and which we have turned back to the previous owners or otherwise disposed of. At the time the authorization bill is before our committee it is not always possible to determine just which of these fields must be taken back. Therefore, it becomes necessary for the Congress to grant general authorizations to the military in order to take care of these contingencies.

After the authorization bill has been passed by the Congress, the Navy then proceeds to pin point its locations, either for the extension of runways or for the acquisition of new sites, or for the reacquisition of auxiliary sites which had previously been used. That is the important part of this whole controversy.

Under the circumstances I have just outlined, the Navy is required to report the exact location and the cost of that location to the Committee on Armed Services for its concurrence or its rejection. As has been pointed out, the Navy has been following this procedure for nearly 10 years. It has been compelled by law to, however, since 1944, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason I am not too disturbed about a situation that is taking place in my own district right today. The Navy has surveyors out today surveying for an auxiliary jet airfield. People are concerned about the taking of this airfield for what reason? Because of the fact that in that area there are now three auxiliary fields that were built during the last war. Those fields are located within a radius of 15 or 20 miles. The immediate proposal is to take an entirely new site located half way between two existing fields that are only 20 miles apart. Mr. Speaker, I submit there is no sense in that. I am not too concerned about it because I know the new site cannot be acquired until after the proposal has been submitted to this Congress and the committee has made a determination as to whether it is wise and in the public interest to acquire the new site or to acquire the additional area that may be necessary at an existing field to extend the runways in that way.

While I do not contend that the Navy is infallible, I am convinced that the record of the Navy in this respect stands head and shoulders above the record of either the Army or the Air Force.

I do not doubt that the present requirement that the Navy report its real estate transactions in advance has required a limited amount of additional work by the Navy. On the other hand I am certain as a result of the personal conversations I have had with high ranking naval officers that the Navy position in its real estate transactions is greatly strengthened in its dealings with the public due to the required concurrence of appropriate congressional committees.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my chairman, not solely because he is my chairman, but because I am convinced that he is right. I am confident that more than two-thirds of this body also believe that he is right and will so state when the time comes to stand up and be counted.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, what we propose in this bill which the President has vetoed is to have your representatives protect your money. The money that these people in the Department of Defense spend affects 150,000,000 people, and 35 of the finest Members of this Congress that I have ever met, are sitting there as your representatives protecting your money and asking no favors.

Once upon a time we used to refer reverently to a document known as the Constitution. Occasionally I read that document and see what they used to do. I read it here again this morning and under section 8 of the article referring to the powers of the Congress, I found this statement:

To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

That is exactly what we are doing, the veto to the contrary notwithstanding. I think this is one of the greatest mistakes the President has ever made. I am going to help him save himself from his own mistake—and I make no apologies for it. We are going to do exactly that today. That grand chairman at whose feet I have sat for 11 years, as St. Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, I will have you

understand, has not served in this Congress for 37 years for nothing. He has forgotten more about the Armed Forces of this Nation than RIVERS will ever learn, and that goes for a lot of these other Johnnys-come-lately.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Let us override this veto and get it over with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the subcommittee handling these projects of the armed services.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, our very able chairman has covered this subject, which is a most important subject, effectively and clearly, and I shall try not to repeat any of the points he brought out.

I would like, however, to try to answer one or two of the matters that have come out in the debate. First of all I would like to explain how these acquisitions and disposals are handled in the committee. There is no delay. They come up from the Navy Department and are referred to the committee, and each proposed acquisition or disposal is sent out to the members of the committee. They have the opportunity to disapprove them within a limited time—a very limited time which, in fact, was shortened only recently to a time limit of a few days. If they do not disapprove them within that time, they are automatically approved. But it does have this effect: it lets the departments first know that their acquisitions and disposals are going to be looked at. That in itself has amounted to an immeasurable saving. I say "immeasurable" because of course we cannot measure things that have been stopped but which would have happened had it not been for this regulation.

Now, we speak about precedents. The best precedent is the precedent that has been followed in one department for approximately 5 or 6 years. The Navy Department has had to come up to the committee with its acquisitions and disposals. I say to this House, we should either repeal the law as to the Navy Department, or extend it as to these other two services.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said that we are standing on a bad precedent. I say the answer to that is obviously that if other committees would do the same thing that the Armed Services Committee is doing in this instance, the savings might be unprecedented.

Mr. SASSCER. Undoubtedly, but the need is greater in the Armed Forces than any other Department because history has shown that in acquisitions and purchases that these services go from feast to famine and in so doing the country and taxpayers can be hurt two ways. First, in the unnecessary expenditures of money in acquisitions; and second, the disapproval of proposed disposals when there is a probability of military need in the reasonable future. There was a lot of property disposed of at the end of the last war which could be used to advantage now. As to the argument on the constitutionality of this bill, we all know that the Congress is called upon to provide for the Army and Navy. In saving vast sums of money in these other two services we are following the Constitution in providing for these services, in seeing that the money is used to the best possible advantage.

At this time Congress must be expense conscious and savings conscious. But in and out of the Congress the primary thinking is directed to governmental spending in the departments. Cuts and eliminations in Government agencies must be forced to an irreducible minimum, but actually the departmental expenditure is only 1.4 percent of the national budget. We talk about that but seldom is thought, in and out of Congress, given to defense spending because our people, in their patriotism and in appreciation of the importance of defense, infrequently think of costs. But when 41.4 percent of the national budget for 1952 is to be expended by the Armed Forces, we can effect real savings in a lush field without at all affecting the result to be obtained if the Congress does its utmost to see that we obtain dollar value for dollars spent and that no lands are acquired nor unnecessary leases of hotels or office space executed.

This bill does not require law but merely requires approval of the Armed Services Committees of both Houses before acquisitions and disposals of land are entered into, and will effect real savings in substantial amounts by eliminating duplication and unnecessary expenditures.

The Navy has worked under a similar law for years and they are adjusted to it, and it has not held them up at all because they get quick action up here. The other two services object to this law that has worked so well and saved tax money in the Navy Department. It is not an attempt to administer the services, as has been said in the debate, but its passage will prohibit unnecessary purchases of real estate and the making of leases, as happened in the case of the Army in the last war, and as is going on without congressional supervision now in both the Army and the Air Force.

This requirement as to the Navy has prevented unnecessary expenditures, purchases, and leases, many times followed up by either the use of existing locations or other sites just as good, even though a little more inconvenient.

I hope the House overrides the veto.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Under the Constitution, this question must be determined by the yeas and nays.

As many as are in favor of passing the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, will as their names are called vote "yea." Those opposed will vote "nay."

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 68, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—312

Aandahl	Elston	Mansfield
Abbitt	Engle	Marshall
Abernethy	Evins	Martin, Iowa
Albert	Fallon	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Calif.	Feighan	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Meader
Allen, La.	Fenton	Merrow
Andersen,	Fisher	Miller, Md.
H. Carl	Ford	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Forrester	Mills
Andresen,	Frazier	Morano
August H.	Fugate	Morris
Andrews	Fulton	Morrison
Arends	Furcolo	Morton
Armstrong	Gamble	Mumma
Aspinall	Garmatz	Murphy
Auchincloss	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Ayres	Gathings	Nelson
Bakewell	Gavin	Nicholson
Barden	George	Norblad
Baring	Golden	Norrell
Bates, Mass.	Goodwin	O'Hara
Battle	Gore	O'Konski
Beall	Gossett	Ostertag
Beckworth	Graham	Passman
Belcher	Grant	Patten
Bender	Greenwood	Patterson
Bennett, Fla.	Gregory	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	Phillips
Bentsen	Gwinn	Pickett
Berry	Hagen	Polk
Betts	Hale	Potter
Bishop	Hall,	Poulson
Blackney	Edwin Arthur	Preston
Boggs, Del.	Hand	Price
Boggs, La.	Harden	Prouty
Bolton	Hardy	Quinn
Bow	Harris	Radwan
Boykin	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Bramblett	Harrison, Wyo.	Rankin
Breen	Havenner	Reams
Brehm	Hays, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Reed, N. Y.
Bryson	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Budge	Herter	Regan
Buffett	Heselton	Ribicoff
Burdick	Hess	Riehlman
Burleson	Hill	Riley
Burton	Hillings	Rivers
Busbey	Hinshaw	Robeson
Bush	Hoeven	Rogers, Co'
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fl
Camp	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Ma
Canfield	Holmes	Sadlak
Carlyle	Hope	St. George
Case	Horan	Sasscer
Chatham	Hull	Saylor
Chelf	Hunter	Schwabe
Chenoweth	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Chiperfield	James	Scott,
Church	Jarman	Hugh D., Jr
Clemente	Jenison	Scrivner
Clevenger	Jenkins	Scudder
Cole, Kans.	Jensen	Secrest
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson	Seely-Brown
Combs	Jonas	Shafer
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Sheehan
Cooper	Jones,	Shelley
Corbett	Hamilton C.	Short
Cotton	Jones,	Sikes
Coudert	Woodrow W.	Simpson, Ill
Cox	Kean	Simpson, Pa
Crawford	Kearney	Sittler
Cunningham	Kearns	Smith, Kan
Curtis, Mo.	Keating	Smith, Mis
Curtis, Nebr.	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Dague	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Lane	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Stanley
Davis, Wis.	Lantaff	Steed
DeGraffenried	Larcade	Stefan
Delaney	LeCompte	Stigler
Dempsey	Lind	Stockman
Denny	Lovre	Sutton
Devereux	Lucas	Taber
D'Ewart	McConnell	Talle
Dolliver	McCulloch	Taylor
Dondero	McDonough	Teague
Donohue	McGregor	Thomas
Donovan	McKinnon	Thompson,
Doughton	McMillan	Mich.
Doyle	McMullen	Thompson, Tex.
Durham	McVey	Thornberry
Eaton	Mack, Wash.	Tollefson
Elliott	Mahon	Towe

Vail	Werdel	Wilson, Tex.
Van Pelt	Wharton	Winstead
Van Zandt	Wheeler	Withrow
Vaughn	Whitten	Wolcott
Velde	Wickersham	Wolverton
Vinson	Widnall	Wood, Ga.
Vorys	Wigglesworth	Wood, Idaho
Vursell	Williams, Miss.	Woodruff
Walter	Williams, N. Y.	Yorty
Watts	Willis	
Weichel	Wilson, Ind.	

NAYS—68

Addonizio	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Javits	O'Neill
Bolling	Jones, Mo.	O'Toole
Burnside	Karsten, Mo.	Patman
Cannon	Kelley, Pa.	Priest
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Rabaut
Celler	Kennedy	Ramsay
Crosser	Keogh	Rhodes
Dawson	King	Rodino
Denton	Klein	Rooney
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Lesinski	Sieminski
Fernandez	McCarthy	Spence
Fine	McCormack	Staggers
Flood	McGuire	Tackett
Fogarty	Machrowicz	Trimble
Forand	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Gordon	Madden	Whitaker
Granger	Mitchell	Wier
Hart	Moulder	Yates
Hedrick	Multer	Zablocki
Heller	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—52

Adair	Deane	Latham
Angell	Dingell	Lyle
Bailey	Dorn	McGrath
Baker	Ellsworth	Magee
Barrett	Gillette	Miller, Calif.
Beamer	Granahan	Miller, N. Y.
Blatnik	Green	Morgan
Bonner	Hall,	Murray, Wis.
Bosone	Leonard W.	Perkins
Bray	Halleck	Poage
Brooks	Harvey	Powell
Brownson	Hays, Ark.	Redden
Buckley	Irving	Richards
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Roberts
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Kersten, Wis.	Sabath
Colmer	Kilday	Sheppard
Crumpacker	Kirwan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Colmer and Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Halleck and Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Granahan against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall and Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Bray and Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Crumpacker and Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Miller of New York and Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gillette and Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Brownson and Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Redden and Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Angell.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, May 15, the Clerk had read down to and including line 25 on page 34 of the bill.

Are there any amendments to be offered at this point?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: On page 33, line 11, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is our hope that we can complete the consideration of this bill this afternoon and that we can proceed promptly and tend to the business at hand. I hope we can confine our remarks entirely to the bill, so that we can get done with it.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to say this amendment does not in any way reduce the amount of the appropriation for the ACP funds. That was disposed of Tuesday. The purpose of the amendment is, however, to reduce the amount that any one participant might receive under the program. In 1947 the limitation was $10,000. In 1948 it was cut to $500, and in 1949, $750. In 1947, my information is that 80 percent of the participants got 40 percent of the money and 20 percent of the participants received 60 percent of the money. It seems to me we are all agreed the purpose of this program is to preserve the fertility of our soil and to conserve our natural resources. They are incentive payments—payments so that our people will hand this land on down to future generations. The amendment does not cut anybody out. It only limits one participant to $1,000. That seems to me to be a fair and just limitation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to assure the gentleman that so far as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and I are concerned, we are glad to agree to his amendment and I hope the amendment prevails.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman that the purpose of the soil-conservation program is to preserve the land and build up the fertility of the land and protect its productivity over the years. If that is the purpose of the program, do you not think that you will be handicapping the program by restricting the land on which the program will be applied?

Mr. ABBITT. This does not restrict the land whatever. It only restricts the amount of money which the large landowners and the large corporations can receive. They are in a position to carry out these land practices. In my opinion, the ones we want to help are the family farm owners and those who are not able to carry on unless they have some help from our Government. We do not want to unnecessarily pay out money to the people who are going to do this anyhow. It is an educational program, as I understand it, to help people who need the help. The large landowners who draw from $1,000 to $2,500 do not need that extra money to carry out the proper conservation practices.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think the gentleman has a basic misconception of what the program is. It is not a program to provide relief for farmers, but to provide for soil-conservation practices for the greatest amount of land in the country possible. Do you not think that the whole idea of the program is to provide benefits for the land instead of for the farmers?

Mr. ABBITT. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am glad the gentleman has offered the amendment and I shall support it. In the discussion the other day great emphasis was laid on the fact that this was a program for the smaller farmer. Four years ago—I have no more recent figures, although perhaps the committee has—80 percent of these payees got less than $100; 65 percent of them got less than $60. I thought we should go under $1,000, but I am glad to withhold my amendment and will support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas to the amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: Strike out "$1,000" and insert "$750."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the maximum payment to individuals from $2,500 to $750 under the Production and Marketing Administration.

Assuming the appropriation of $225,000,000 is not reduced, the funds saved by this amendment will be divided among those who get the smaller payments. If you adopt my amendment, those presently getting $2,500 and less down to $750 will still get $750 each. In doing so, you can save about $25,000,000 unless, of course, larger payments are made to smaller participants.

I agree with the gentleman from Virginia who offered the amendment to provide a maximum of $1,000, that more can be accomplished in the conservation of the soil by being more liberal

with those who receive smaller payments than to give so much of this money to the big operators. It should be observed this is separate from the big soil-conservation program for which funds are appropriated to the extent of two or three hundred million dollars a year for the employment of engineers and others who provide coordinated plans and give technical advice for conservation of land and crops. That conservation program has accomplished a great deal of good for this country. As above stated, it is separate from the program under consideration, except a part of these funds may be used in carrying out a part of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. Chairman, in these days when there is demand for saving taxpayers' money, it seems to me that those who get the larger payments from the Government for improving their own farms, ought to be willing to reduce the contribution from the Government to $750, rather than ask the Government to pay them $2,500 for doing the thing they ought to do on their own land. I remind you the maximum was $750 for a period of 2 years. There was no complaint from the average farmer.

This appropriation is for $225,000,000. Under this bill, 3.4 percent of the payees will receive $40,000,000. Think that over and see where the big share of this money is spent.

This is the way it worked last year. Out of $255,000,000, 40,000 payees got $38,500,000, which means that 1.3 percent of all of the payees got 15 percent of the money.

There were 3,097,000 participants in this program in 1950. They received an average of approximately $82. Now listen to this. Out of 3,097,000 people who received $255,000,000 last year, 560,000 received less than $20. More than one-sixth of the whole 3,000,000 people got from $1 to $20 each. How much soil conservation could $3,000,000 farmers do who received less than $20 each? Explain that if you will.

It is clear to see that the great majority of the farmers of this country did not get very much out of this program. As a matter of fact, 55.7 percent, more than half of them, got from $1 to $60, no more than $60, and yet these people who oppose this amendment would have you think that you are treating a great majority of the farmers of this country with great benevolence. I wish the farmers could know just how you are handling this thing.

One more thing. The group who get $500 or more are only 2 percent in number of those who participate. Think of it; only 2 out of every 100 get $500 or more, but they get a total of approximately $45,000,000, which again is about 20 percent of the entire $225,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, if you do not want to save approximately $25,000,000 and put it back into the Treasury, you can, without reducing the appropriation, pay it to more than 2,000,000 participants who will get less than $60 apiece. Let me repeat, under the bill, unless you adopt this amendment, you are going to pay $45,000,000 to only 15 percent of those who participate in the program. On the other hand, you are going to pay 2,385,000 farmers, or 77 percent of those who participate, less than $100 each, and yet those who oppose my amendment will shout to the housetops and say that I am by this amendment sniping at a bill because they want to pay $2,500 apiece to a number of big landowners and plantation operators, rather than pay it to the little fellow who only gets $40 or $50. He is told by this committee in doing so that the Government is particularly benevolent to him. He would not think so if he knew the facts.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to pay any funds from the Federal Government to help the farmer, then you better allocate it to the independent operator who will use it to some advantage, and not dish out as much as $40,000,000 to about 3 percent of those who participate in the farm program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a participant and who is familiar with this problem and knows a great deal about it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I did not know at the time the Abbitt amendment with $1,000 was offered that the gentleman from Kansas intended to offer one for $750. Personally, I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

In order that the membership of the House may know how expenditures were made in 1950, I am including herewith a statement in round figures that I secured from the Department of Agriculture showing how PMA funds were distributed last year:

Payments	Payees	Amount paid
$1,000 to $2,500	10,000	[1] $16,818,000
$500 to $1,000	30,000	[2] 21,626,000
$400 to $500	25,000	[3] 10,813,000
$300 to $400	40,000	[4] 13,455,000
$200 to $300	92,000	22,126,000
$150 to $200	165,000	27,756,000
$100 to $150	350,000	42,057,000
$60 to $100	660,000	50,728,000
$40 to $60	525,000	25,228,000
$20 to $40	640,000	18,462,000
$1 to $20	560,000	5,931,000
Total	3,097,000	255,000,000

[1] 6.6 percent.
[2] 8½ percent.
[3] 4.2 percent.
[4] 5.3 percent.

I think anyone who is willing to examine these figures will understand that irrespective of the orations that are being delivered by those who oppose my amendment, that although they are spending $225,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, they are not passing very much of it on to the man who operates what may be described as the family-sized farm.

Please take a look at the table. How much soil conservation can 560,000 farmers do when each of them gets less than $20. Look again. Six hundred and forty thousand others will get from $20 to $40 each. So, 1,200,000 farmers out of 3,000,000 will receive less than $40. I think it is clear to those willing to examine this table that you pay $55,000,000 to 65,000 payees, and then you try to satisfy a million and a half farmers by dividing $55,000,000 among them. It hardly seems fair, does it?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this program were a handout to farmers I would be opposed to it. We are thinking in terms of conservation of our soil and whether we conserve the soil on the hills, the slopes, the plains, or elsewhere, it is conservation of the soil that we need and that we must have.

There are some faults with this program; all of us who are familiar with farming know that there are some faults with this program. We know there are some things that ought to be done to make this program better. Some of the practices that are the most needed for the conservation of our soil are not on large farms, as the debate seems to be directed to, but are on small farms. Practices may require a large expenditure in a year. I am thinking about those funds that are needed for such things as gully control and terracing which require mechanical tools to correct.

This program has a weakness, that it is set up on an annual basis. Perhaps some of the objection to this program could be overcome in connection with the payment for these practices if it extended over a longer period of years so that the farmers could make arrangements to pay for the improvement over a longer period of years. When he hires machinery to come in and stop erosion and fix up his gullies a tremendous burden of expense is placed upon him in one year which you cannot pay with a $750 or $1,000 limitation. That is a permanent improvement; that is something that stays there. The putting in of sod waterways, the putting in of dams, the putting in of anything that requires construction takes more than $500 or $750, or even more than $1,000 on small farms, and my district is made up of small farms. We are thinking in terms of things which must be done as far as permanent improvements are concerned.

If you want to fritter money away and get but little out of it, cut this program down to where it is a matter of handing out a subsidy to the farmers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman realizes that in his own State 80 percent of those who participate get less than $100.

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly I realize that. We are thinking in terms of soil conservation. When we think in terms of soil conservation a different picture is presented to us, and the sooner we realize that the sooner we recognize one of the problems that face us in this country. We keep hammering on the thought that we are talking in terms of a small payment or a handout to a farmer, and then immediately we begin to think in terms of subsidies. Let us start thinking about conserving the soil. That is the purpose of this program. In the gentleman's own State he must know of a good many practices which require an outlay of a considerable amount of money.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman knows that in his State and in my State you cannot do much soil-conservation work with $40 or $20 or $10.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course not. I realize that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Would it not be a whole lot better, to take the gentleman's version of it, and put in a provision for $750 and if the Soil Conservation Service wants to use the money for the little fellow, all right. You cannot do much when you have only $75 or $80 toward conserving your farm.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman talks with some wisdom and it is too bad that his foresight is not greater and that he cannot visualize and see what is happening in his own district. If he would think about the matter in terms of a permanent improvement, and I think he is interested in permanent improvements——

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is not interested in any stopgap measure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want the farmers to make the improvements themselves.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is the purpose of this program. It is a program that will enable the farmer to carry on practices that will help solve the problem, but the gentleman is limiting the expenditure of the funds with his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. To $750.

Mr. MARSHALL. Let me answer the gentleman's question. It will be helpful to me and I am sure it will be helpful to him. When you start to cut down the amount of expenditure that can be made in any one year, we will cause the larger proportion of this fund to go into practices that are not of a permanent nature, which he and I criticize. I am sure the gentleman must realize that.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and his colleague from Kansas have offered to this bill, it seems to me, serve a purpose entirely different from their professed belief in what the Government program should do. This is not a WPA handout, it is not a subsidy for the farmers, it is not a bonus that the farmers get, it is not a matter of trying to distribute to the most people in order to get the most votes.

The purpose of these soil conservation payments is to provide an incentive by which the greatest number of acres in the country can be utilized by good conservation practices so that they will be preserved and used in the future where the richness of the soil may continue to contribute to the richness of the country.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, the farmer himself puts up from $2 to $3 for every $1 that the Government matches?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Of course. In connection with these payments that come up to $2,500 it means expenditures will be made of from five to ten thousand dollars for conservation purposes upon some farm during the year in which the money is paid out. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] mentioned in his able presentation of this matter, there are many of the most vital soil conservation projects which involve a large expenditure of money. It is too bad they are restricted to a 1-year period so far as incentive is concerned. When you attempt to control gulleys, when you attempt to control sheet erosion, you cannot go out and just put up a fence, dig a ditch or something like that. It involves an engineering program that must mean something for the entire community or a large segment of acreage or a large portion of a farm. I think this Congress would be resorting to WPA boondoggling tactics if it subsidized to buy votes by cutting the limitation on what soil conservation payments can be made so they will be distributed to the largest number of farmers. Why can we not change the amendment and provide that every farmer get $25, if you want to give the most payments to the most farmers? We are trying to build up these conservation practices, not pass out the most money to the largest number of farmers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I can understand that the gentleman may have big operators in his State, such as plantation owners, who would get these large payments; but it seems to me that as between the two, the large plantation owner, the big operator, would be glad and willing and does to a great degree take care of the things which the gentleman is talking about. On the other hand, you are appropriating two-hundred-and-some-odd-million dollars, would it not be better for the country at large to divide this fund and give a little more of it to the small operator who only has a small acreage rather than give a large amount of it, as was just suggested here, something like 15 or 16 percent of all this money, to only 1½ percent of the operators?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The program that the gentleman seems to suggest, it seems to me, as only a logical conclusion, would be to take this money and divide it on a head basis among all the farmers of the country. In that way you would reach the largest number of farmers. What I am trying to do in my opposition to this amendment is to attempt to get soil conservation practices established on the largest number of acres in this country.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The table that the gentleman from Kansas is quoting in connection with the size of the payments had nothing whatsoever to do with the size of the farm. There is nothing in there about the acreage of the farm. That is payment to each farm on the basis of practices that they carry out, as a matter of digging ditches, as a matter of terracing, and doing that sort of thing, and a 40-acre farm or 20-acre farm may require a large expenditure in one year. But, when the job is done, it is done, so this program and this limitation that the gentleman from Kansas is talking about is of real assistance to the small farmer when he can use in a year $2,500, but you correct some of these practices so far as the things that are destroying his soil are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is right. In my experience I can mention payments to operators of large plantations, 4,000 and 5,000 acres, who get only $40 or $50 a year out of this program, and that is because they have only indulged in conservation practices to that extent.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think under the circumstances, and considering the terrific expenses by the Government, and considering that the large landowners are doing pretty well, that they would not expect the Government to help them to the extent of $2,500 on a thing of this?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is still completely confused. This is not an effort to help the large landowners. This is an effort to not only help to to improve our land, but to save it for generations to come. Some of the biggest payments made in my State have been made to small landowners in badly eroded hill country, in taking steps to preserve a 40- or 100-acre farm and to restore it to production and keep it in production for years to come. This is not an effort for anything in behalf of the large landowners; it is in behalf of the land of the United States. I appeal to the House to consider this when they vote. If you vote to cut down these payments you are actually voting for Government subsidy to farmers on a head basis. If you vote for the soil-conservation program for the future, you will do something about making these payments applicable on a large scale to whatever conservation practices seem most applicable to the land concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have never understood that this PMA program was only in the interest of the small operator. I

have regarded it and I believe that everybody else has regarded it as a program which is in the interest of the general welfare of all the people of America. The program contemplates the protection of all of the farms and ranch lands of this great country, the idea being that we will preserve the Nation's richest resource, the fertile top soil of the farms and ranches of this Republic. If the authors of these amendments have a different idea about the program, they certainly have not made their views very clear to the Members of the House.

If the program is restricted further, then you can visualize a farmer who operates his farm through tenants. He might be eliminated from the program. The tenants will not participate. The soil will not be protected. The fertility of the soil will be wasted, and we will defeat the very purposes of the program.

Actually, I come from a part of the country where we have numerous little farms. If you look at the $2,500 limitation, you must realize that all of the people we refer to as big operators have already been eliminated from the program. I have never regarded this as a Government hand-out. I regard it as an investment in a national resource of vital importance to the people of this country.

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

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. The so-called big operator to whom the gentleman just referred has been limited by virtue of the fact there is already a limit of $2,500 on these payments.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of that has been to eliminate the big operator, the big corporation, to whom the gentleman has referred. Actually, I have probably less at stake in this amendment than any man here, because I come from an area where we have a lot of small farms. I dare say it would not very adversely affect the people of my district. But out in your country, out in the great, wide open spaces of America, it will affect the landowners and not only the landowners but the tenants.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you do not reduce the appropriation from what you have here, the committee has reduced it from last year, so we are going to have less money. The people in the gentleman's State get an average of less than $60 per payment, do they not?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you are going to use the $225,000,000 that you are appropriating——

Mr. COOLEY. It leaves more money for my part of the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. For the smaller operators.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. So I say I have less right to complain about it than anybody. But I do not regard these things from a sectional standpoint or as limited to my own district or my own county. I think you are going to cripple this program. As I said here the other day, I do not think any mathematician or economist connected with any department of the Government can evaluate this program if we look down through the future for a thousand years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman is right about that, he ought to increase this appropriation, and make it twice as much.

Mr. COOLEY. I was perfectly willing to increase the appropriation. The gentleman is not telling me anything. I voted for it when it was over a half a billion dollars a year and never had cause to regret it. I remember that the gentleman, although he is a great friend of agriculture, seems to be dissatisfied with every bill that is brought out here that attempts to provide some relief for agricultural people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is no sniping at all.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman comes now with an amendment to cut it down to $750.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am for the little fellow, not the big man.

Mr. COOLEY. All right. We are all for the little man. But what is going to happen to the little tenants on the farms down in North Carolina and the farms in Mississippi and the farms in the gentleman's district?

Mr. REES of Kansas. He will get more money under my amendment than he will under the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. COOLEY. His landlord will say, "No, we are not interested in this program and we will not build up the soil because we will not benefit by the program."

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that the adoption of the pending amendment, which is perhaps designed to restrict the large operator, will actually hurt the small tenant and the small operator, because so much of the land in this country is owned by people who operate on a relatively large basis as compared to certain other areas; so while the amendment is no doubt offered to restrict the large operator, in operation it would hurt not so much the large operator in the long run as it would hurt the soil-conservation program as a whole and hurt the little tenant?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is probably right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time so that I may inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the event the pending bill is disposed of and the final vote taken today, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the House go over until Monday, there being no business tomorrow.

Mr. KILBURN. I object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in soil conservation. I have many soil-conservation projects in my district and I certainly do not want to see the large operator get more than his fair share of the money that we appropriate for this program. I do, however, want the program to be successful. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia who proposed the amendment limiting individual payments to $1,000, and likewise the gentleman from Kansas, who lowered that to $750, if they are not making somewhat of a mistake and doing a grave injustice in certain cases.

In my particular congressional district there are valleys in which there are 12, 14, or more farms, and there are unquestionably innumerable congressional districts throughout the United States that have the same or similar characteristics. At the head, or nearly at the head of these valleys there is one spot which, if it is taken care of properly, would conserve the soil of the entire valley. By the limitation of $1,000 you will be doing a grave injustice to the man on whose farm the project is located, because you would make him expend a great deal more money than $1,000, when, as a matter of fact, that soil-conservation practice at that particular spot would affect the entire valley. Does the gentleman from Kansas not see the injustice of that sort of situation? How can you place a limitation of that kind and be realistic about it when there are perhaps 12 or 15 farms in the valley where near the head of the valley there is one farm upon which, if you installed an earth dam or other soil-conservation practice, you could probably eliminate almost entirely the destruction of the soil in the entire valley. The limitation of $750 as proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] would endanger, if not make ineffective, practical soil conservation in my congressional district.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know how well informed the gentleman is with respect to farm operations, but I take it he is well informed and understands the problem and knows about the problem of his own experience. At least I hope the gentleman does.

In the first place there is nothing at all to prevent these 14 farms that you speak of from going ahead and trying out a program if they want to work together on any program. If the 14 or so farms want to do soil-conservation work of course they would be entitled to the limit of $750 each. But the gentleman does not know of a single farm in his own district, and he cannot name a single farm of average size which, under the program, with all the practices that he can put into effect on an average farm, who gets $750. The gentleman could not point out such a farm in his own State. As a matter of fact $750 would be higher than the average, be-

cause the average receives less than $750 in his State. If you want to be realistic about the thing you will find in your own district, and I have the figures here, that you have hardly anybody receiving that much. You talk about these 14 or so farms. If they all want to work together, they can get $500 or $750 apiece and comply with the program and do the necessary work.

I am looking at this in a realistic manner, as the gentleman is.

Mr. WITHROW. I would like to know from someone aside from the gentleman from Kansas whether or not it is possible under this program for say 12 or 15 farmers to get together on a program and get $750 each under the provisions of the present soil-conservation act.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Provided they qualify.

Mr. WITHROW. Provided they qualify. Yes, indeed. But why place this limitation of $750? You already have a limitation of $2,500, which keeps the big fellow out of this. There is a limitation upon him. Why not let us go ahead with the program where we need help that will be constructive? Not only that, you say right now there are not any projects in my district that would cost more than $750.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. In my district there are any number of projects that are under contemplation at this time, that would cost considerably more than $750. Under this amendment you would place a limitation upon them, which would make it impossible to go ahead with the projects.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHROW. I do not yield.

To my mind, it would be most unwise to adopt either of these two limitations. To argue that they should be adopted under the guise of attempting to economize is an absurdity. We all know that if the program is to be a success it must actually conserve the soil. The proposed limitations would merely handicap the program and would, in my opinion, doom it to almost sure failure. We all seem to be quite in agreement that our soil must be conserved. Therefore, permit the people who are actually engaged in the soil-conservation program to operate unhampered by limitations of this kind.

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

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If it is a fact that the gentleman does not have a farm in his district that would be affected by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, I think it speaks well for the gentleman from Wisconsin to oppose the amendment, which shows that he is looking at it from an over-all standpoint.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

I sincerely hope that these two limitation amendments will be promptly voted down by the House.

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

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly in the very fine remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], my good chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW], and others who have spoken in opposition to these amendments.

When this soil-conservation program was first inaugurated, there was no limitation whatever. Later on, a limitation of $10,000 was applied. Then, in the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, Mr. Jones, who was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, brought in what was known as H. R. 3800, which would have reduced soil-conservation payments to $5,000. That bill was not enacted into law although the House Committee on Agriculture approved it. The $10,000 limitation remained in effect until the Eightieth Congress, when it was reduced to $750. The Eighty-first Congress put into effect the $2,500 limitation, which is on the statute books today.

We have had these arguments ever since I have been in Congress. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has come in here repeatedly. One year he offered an amendment to make the limitation $250. The House of course did not look with favor upon such an amendment. We cannot conserve the soil of America by limiting these payments to $750 or $1,000. One of the greatest arguments I ever heard about the value of soil conservation was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before the Committee on Agriculture. He emphasized the point that the topsoil is the most valuable asset America has. The proper minerals and salts in the soil is a prerequisite to the production of good food to go on the tables of the American people.

I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], our Agriculture Committee chairman, for bringing out a most important feature of the whole matter. A similar comment was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. That is this, that a large farm is nothing but an aggregation of several small farms; and until the landowner comes into the program you are denying the share tenants a chance to participate in this program; he is out completely because of the fact that he cannot come in by himself; the landowner has to sign up for these benefits.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman does not say, though, that the income is anything like equitably distributed giving those very small people a fair advantage.

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not believe in the philosophy to start with that we should limit payments just because a man has saved his money and acquired a little piece of land, farms it successfully, and buys additional acreage. I do not believe in cutting the benefits to which he is entitled under the conservation program just because he has been thrifty. I believe in the American system.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in the philosophy of giving one small farmer, we will say, an acre allotment or a 2-acre allotment?

Mr. GATHINGS. Now, we are not going to get into a discussion of that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in this philosophy?

Mr. GATHINGS. Unless the owner comes into the program, under the law, the tenant cannot participate in the program.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in that philosophy?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not yield further because we are not dealing with cotton allotments.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Of course not; we are talking about the philosophy of fairness.

Mr. GATHINGS. My philosophy is the American philosophy that a man has the right to go out, earn, and increase his holdings.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Tell the House how you feel about the question.

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not yield further to the gentleman. I hope that the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, let us bear in mind that we are talking about two different programs in some instances. The Soil Conservation Service is an entirely different program from that of the Production Marketing Administration.

This limitation is a limitation on the funds to be spent by the Production Marketing Administration and it has nothing to do with the building up of terraces or contouring your hillsides; that is under the Soil Conservation Service. Of course, PMA funds are largely spent for soil-conserving practices.

The second point is, and this is important to keep in mind, that the State committee allots so much money per county and all the money is going to be spent; in fact, they nearly always run out of money in my county. And whether you take care of the big farmers or the small farmers, this money is going to be spent, all of it is going to be spent and that will happen whether this limitation is put into the bill or not. If the limitation is put into the bill it is going to be spent where it is needed most and be given to men who are entitled to it most and its benefits will be put on soils that need conservation most, and those, by and large, are the holdings of the small farmers, not the 5,000-acre farms, and the large ranches.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to call attention to the fact that this program

goes right hand in hand with the soil-conservation program. The Soil Conservation Service program has done an excellent job in their planning; however, the farmer to put those practices into effect must have some means of doing it. That is the program I am talking about, and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me. We are thinking in terms of getting as many permanent improvement practices put into effect as we can.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is right.

Mr. MARSHALL. Therefore, if PMA funds can be used and directed toward such construction that, I think, would be a good answer.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think we probably agree on what we want done. We want to give the the greatest improvement to the most acres, but the gentleman and I, I believe, would do it by different methods. Under my plan it would be spread to more individuals on more farms and would be used in a way and in places where it is most needed and would do the most good. The man who has a 2,000-, a 5,000-, or a 10,000-acre ranch is not in as much need of it as 10 farmers who have small holdings. It is a subsidy that the Government is giving to encourage conservation practices. The more people who can be encouraged under the program, the better.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to commend the gentleman on the incessant effort he has made as a Member of Congress to do something about this very important problem. Unquestionably one of the most unjustifiable results that has obtained, perhaps not purposely, in the administration of the agricultural programs has been that too much goes to too few and too many got far too little from the various programs.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is substantially correct.

Mr. BECKWORTH. As I stated a moment ago, in the district I represent, and I have a letter that came just a few days ago to that effect, we have people who were allotted cotton acreage of one and two and three acres. In some instances, in one particularly, some 400 people in one county got no acreage at all. The pattern of what I am describing here is to be found in some soil conservation activities. Some small farmers benefit little. One of the ways to help bring about equity and justice in this program is to do what our distinguished and very reasonable colleague from Texas has sought to do almost from the time he came to the Congress.

Mr. GOSSETT. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not criticizing my able colleagues who represent their districts well, but most of those who are fighting this amendment the hardest come from the big farming areas. This amendment is simply an effort to distribute money more equitably and where it will do the most good. It is the small farms mostly that are being washed away.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on being consistent at least and I want to point out the fact that while he is willing to reduce this amount he actually about 2 days ago wanted to cut the whole thing to the core, cut out about $75,000,000.

Mr. GOSSETT. I wanted to reduce PMA funds by $75,000,000 to help cut down our perilous deficit. That lacks a lot of being to the core.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is at least consistent.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman. I try to be. If there is such a thing as a farm bloc, Mr. Chairman, I am a member of such bloc. However, farmers are interested in a more efficient program and in saving public money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, the issue here has been pretty well defined. That issue is whether or not this is a program for giving hand-outs to farmers or a program to conserve the soil. That is all there is to it. The theory of the proponents of these amendments seems to be that if the size of the payments is limited more people will get them. On the other hand, an acre of soil on a large farm can erode just as easily as an acre of soil on a small farm and it will cost just as much to put it back into condition.

The gentleman from Texas has referred to the fact that there is a difference between the Soil Conservation Service program and the program providing for soil conservation payments. That is true but, as everyone knows, just recently the Secretary of Agriculture has issued an order which consolidates those programs at the local level and to a very large extent at the higher levels. From now on those two programs will be coordinated as they should be. As a matter of fact the two programs have gradually been meshed together during the past few years with the result that more and more the soil conservation payment program has become more of a program for carrying out the physical treatment of the soil, such as building of dams and terraces and that sort of thing. In other words the work has taken on a more permanent character year after year.

The more we can change this into that kind of a program, the more conservation we are going to get. That should be the ultimate objective and aim of the program and it is working in that direction more and more all the time. If, however, payments are limited too severely the amount of substantial conservation which may be accomplished is bound to be limited.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. Am I incorrect in this? It has always been my impression that soil-conservation payments were made on the basis of what was earned in conserving the soil, whether it be 5 acres, 100 acres, or 1,000 acres. Am I wrong about that impression?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is correct, and I am glad he mentioned it, because it gives me a chance to point out again that it is not a matter of acreage or the size of the farm which determines how much a man earns in the way of payments. It is the practices which he carries out which determine that question. A small farm can very easily earn a larger payment than a large farm, depending upon the practices which are carried out.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] in his excellent discussion made a most significant statement when he pointed out that in a given area, the whole key to soil conservation may depend on the treatment that is given on one farm, and no one can earn the payment of that farm except the man who owns and operates that farm. If he is limited in the funds he can earn, it means that the whole project may fail. To adopt either the Abbitt amendment or the Rees amendment would be a backward step and a blow to the progress of soil conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time, not intending to use it all, but primarily to address a couple of inquiries to the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Kansas with reference to their amendments. It has been said here, and very properly so, that we should not consider this matter on a sectional basis but should look at it from the point of view of the entire country. Certainly one of the factors, if we are going to do that, which we must consider, is the amount involved for the taxpayers in these two amendments. All the talk here has been about how the farmers in this, that or the other section of the country are affected by this legislation. That is, of course, an appropriate subject of inquiry. But we must not forget that those same farmers as well as the wage earners and nearly everyone else is also affected from the point of view of footing the bill to pay for the expenditures we approve, therefore, highly important to determine whether there will be any actual money saved over-all by the adoption of either one of these amendments.

The gentleman from Kansas cited some figures, and I would like verification either from him or the gentleman from Virginia. If I understand it correctly, provided the maximum payment which can be made to any one participant is reduced from $2,500 to $1,000, it should effect a saving of somewhere around $16,000,000 over-all. Am I correct about that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman from Virginia agrees with the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ABBITT. No, I did not say anything about the savings to the taxpayers. What I have in mind is that the committee has cut the appropriation from what it was last year, and that has been upheld by this body. There is less money this

year than what we have now, and my idea is that it will go around to help more if not too much money is given the large operators, for this reason: The man who is going into a large operation has sufficient assets, in my opinion, to carry it out anyway, and when we cut these small farmers, then we are really cutting conservation, in my opinion, and that was the thing I had in mind, making the payment up to $1,000, and the rest he has to carry on himself. The vast majority of these people are engaged in small practices, and I am afraid that they will stop entirely these practices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, just following the gentleman from Virginia, if this is cut to $750—and I realize there is not so much difference in the amount of the payment—there would be approximately $28,000,000 available, and for that reason you would have, unless you are going to reduce this appropriation, that much more money to provide among these small operators.

Mr. ABBITT. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me say this, and it has been referred to here by at least two Members that regard this as a hand-out. It is no hand-out at all. It is a question of viewpoint with regard to the way you use the money. But it is money paid to the individual for doing work on his own land. This partly reimburses him for the service he renders to the country, if you want to put it that way, for conserving the soil. But it is money paid out of the Federal Treasury to the individual. It is not a hand-out or anything of the kind. Get that off your mind.

May I say to the gentleman that the payment has been as low as $750. It was that for 2 years. It has been as low as $500. So this is not an innovation of any kind.

May I say further that it is not the intent to snipe at this bill at all. If you do not want to take these amendments, that is well and good, but let us not call it sniping. It does not sound well, and does not go well with someone who is interested in these matters.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, at the time the gentleman from Virginia was recognized I was seeking recognition to offer an amendment to reduce the over-all figure available for the Production and Marketing Administration program from $225,000,000 to $200,000,000. I realize there were a number here before who voted against the more serious or drastic reduction to $150,000,000 who might support a modest reduction of that kind. I am interested in and troubled by the remarks the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] made, that regardless of what we do on these amendments offered by the gentlemen from Virginia and Kansas the total amount will be spent in any event. For that reason, it seems regrettable to me that the votes are apparently lacking to accomplish a substantial saving in this appropriation of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars for these activities. The farmers themselves, with commendable spirit, have evidenced their approval of a real cut in the item we are considering through one of their spokesmen, Mr. Allen Kline, head of the National Grange. They realize that the waste of public funds or their use to advance political ends injures every segement of our economy.

I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas and, if that fails, the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, but both of them only partially solve the problem before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Far be it from me to question the motives of my friend from Kansas or my friend from Virginia, but there are lots of misapprehensions here from lots of sources. There is a formula for the distribution of such funds as are in the soil conservation program. That formula is the basis for dividing the money as between the States. That formula is the basis for divisions within the State. If my friend were to cut this down to $100 each he would not get a dime more in his county, and if the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia prevailed he would not get a dime more in his county.

Not only that, but the practices that exist in the various States under an over-all classification of projects are determined by the State and county committees, so that they can select those soil practices that are badly needed in that area. Since this amendment does not affect what goes into anybody's State or what goes into anybody's county, why should you not let a county use its amount of money to meet the kind of problems it has? Some counties do have large farms. Nearly all the farmers are small farmers on a big landowner's farm. Why should not that county be permitted to use the money that is allocated to that county to meet the problems of that county? Some folks like the gentleman from Wisconsin have an area where flood control is the problem. Why should not they, if that is their problem and they have selected that as the practice that is greatly needed, set up a project that would relieve the situation?

The amount of the payment does not enter into how much land the man has and how much the money is that goes to him. When you limit the amount you limit the class and kind of project that can be done, and when you hold it down to peanuts you are limiting it to that class of soil conservation practice, which usually has less benefits.

In our committee report this year we stress the fact that we hope attention will be given to permanent and semi-permanent practices. When you reduce this amount of $2,500 to $750 you seriously interfere with that.

Why do I say that? In the Eightieth Congress you had this limitation. You also reduced the amount to $150,000,000. When you did that, dams to conserve water for irrigation or livestock or to control erosion fell off 45 percent. Range and pasture seeding fell off 33 percent. Terraces fell off 21 percent. Farm land drained by open and enclosed drains fell off 41 percent. Reorganizing irrigation ditches, dikes, or laterals to prevent erosion and conserve water fell off 52 percent. Improving pasture and range land by eradicating and controlling unpalatable and poisonous plants fell off 52 percent.

The amount of money you get is fixed by the formula. We recognize in the law that each State and each county should select practices that are badly needed in the several counties. I will be the first to give the gentleman from Kansas the right the law gives him to select the practices and limitations, and his county committee can fix limitations with the approval of the State committee on the amount that goes to any one farm. But I do say that since this money goes to delta counties or western counties or goes to the mountain counties of the western section of the country, if they want to have larger projects and need these larger projects, since that money has gone to them under the formula fixed by the Congress, I think it would be unsound for me, because my problems are different, to try to limit their projects. You did not do it in the basic law. You said there should be an over-all book or catalog of project, but you said that each State and each county in the over-all picture shall select those things that are needed, and shall determine the basis upon which you contribute to the cost of the projects in those areas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman in view of the limitation of time, but I have listened to the gentleman repeatedly, and he has had to listen to me, but I do think he is trying to spread the problems which he has in his area over the Nation, and they do not quite fit. Far be it from me to try to put on his county and his State that which he does not want and which does not fit his area. But it follows that I think he is wrong to say that a county which has received so much money in the past under this program cannot work out projects that fit that county.

For that reason I hope you will defeat these amendments because if you do not defeat them you are in effect repealing the basic law.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 35, noes 72.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. ABBITT) there were—ayes 50, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the request for tellers comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, as the Clerk had already started reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), and to provide assistance in obtaining equipment, materials, and facilities necessary to attain needed production of agricultural commodities, $8,300,000, of which not more than $2,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express interest at this time in this particular section and disappointment over the fact that it is my understanding the committee has not made any provision whereby the Agricultural Production and Marketing Administration would provide for the measurement of cotton acreage for 1951. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether or not that is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to agree with the gentleman that one of the greatest problems we had in trying to work out the cotton acreage was the fact that we did not have adequate records. I would be forced to agree with the gentleman that there are two ways to provide money. One is for the committee to bring it in, and the other is to offer amendments. The committee has not provided funds for that purpose. It was not provided by the budget, and if the gentleman has been around for the last 2 or 3 days, and I know he has been here actively participating, he can see that we are having trouble holding the line for appropriations even where we have reduced them. So having included money over and above the budget, it was just our belief that, serious as the situation was and great as the need was, that for the time being, the committee reached the conclusion that we just could not do it. So for that reason the amount is not in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the gentleman and many others that the necessity for reducing nonessential expenditures is very great. I, too, have voted for economy and reductions of nonessential spending when I could justify them. My record is clear. This is necessary and essential. I think one of the greatest disservices that can be rendered to the cotton farmers of this country is the fact that there is no provision for adequate records, and yet when the time comes to impose cotton allotments, if it does in the future, you have no records whatsoever. Everyone knows the difficulty we had last year was from the fact that the so-called Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported one acreage in the county, the farmers reported another, and the county committees reported another. Finally we got into such a dilemma that it was absolutely necessary for the Congress to do something about it in order to clear it up for the year 1950. Yet we come along in 1951 and propose later to again impose such controls on the cotton farmers. You are going to find yourselves in the same dilemma. To me that is not economy. That is an injustice to the cotton farmers of this country.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure that the gentleman did not mean it like it sounded, as though the committee had ruined the cotton farmer in not bringing in the money. As I said, there are two ways to get this. One is for the committee to bring it in, and the other is to offer an amendment. I have not heard any amendment offered yet. I agree that the need for it is great, but I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is not exactly easy to get some of the money that we need for other things.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the very able gentleman [Mr. WHITTEN] and his committee. You have done a good job and worked hard on this appropriation. I am inclined to think that the gentleman's committee should have brought in the money necessary for measurement of cotton acreage for this year and I believe this House, in view of the experience we had last year, would have upheld the gentleman's committee. The gentleman knows I have considered preparing an amendment. I talked to him about it. I talked to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to the ranking member of that committee, and to other members of your committee. All of you seem to agree with me that it should be done, but you think it should not be brought in here as an amendment. Yet you do bring in, according to the report, funds in the agricultural production program amounting to $2,500,000 for a so-called national-defense program.

Just what that contains I do not know. It seems to me that we could very well increase the national-defense program by providing adequate records for the future for any national-defense requirement rather than simply making the statement "this is for the national-defense program," and nobody knows what the national defense program is.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi because I want to have a record made.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that he has talked to me about this program. I readily agree with him as to the problem involved and further agree that it would be well if this work were done. I also raised the question with the gentleman of how he would get funds for it at this time. I notice the gentleman has not offered his amendment. I think I told the gentleman that I would not oppose his amendment, although I cannot act for the whole committee. This bill would be different in several particulars if I could. But I do recognize the problem. I refuse, however, to take any responsibility for not having it in this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 35, line 5, insert after the comma the following: "including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on farms, whether or not marketing quotas are in effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the difficulty in endeavoring to provide funds——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not asking the gentleman to yield. I wish to make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late; the gentleman has already been recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment simply because the cotton farmers of this country should have some way of compelling a record to be made of the 1951 cotton crop. It is true, I believe—and I have talked to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture—that consideration is being given by members of his great committee to provide a program for this 1951 year, but it is well known that an effort was made in the latter part of the last Congress to do something about it. While the program did pass this House, it never did get through the other body.

This, to me, Mr. Chairman, would, in my opinion, be a directive to the Production and Marketing Administration, through the county committees as the law requires, to undertake a program of determining the cotton acreage in the counties in the cotton-producing areas throughout the United States for future reference, if and when acreage allotments are put into effect. If farmers are again forced to controls and will have to submit to acreage allotments and quotas they will at least have a record on which they could rely of the 1951 crop and thus avoid the inequities and injustices by the BAE estimates and merely guesses. It is not right that total counties' acreage planted be pulled out of thin air. A record should be made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, with whom I have discussed this problem, as well as with other Members.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And I am sympathetic with the gentleman's problem. But I should like to know how much money is involved here, how much of this $8,300,000 would be taken for this work? Has the gentleman any idea as to that?

Mr. HARRIS. In all deference to the gentleman from Mississippi, the able chairman of the subcommittee—and I

appreciate his position and the fact he wants this program carried out and recognizes the importance and desire for the measurement of 1951 cotton acreage for future records, if and when needed. I do not want us to be faced with any such dilemma as we had last year. Answering the gentleman from Minnesota, I would say probably a million dollars. I know that some down at the Department of Agriculture contend that if we go into this, measure the 1951 cotton crop, and make a record as we should have, it would take an entirely new staff and personnel. They say it would probably take about $5,000,000. In my opinion, however, with the existing county organizations set up, committees set up in each county, I do not see why with the funds here, $8,300,000, for administering OPC program, these county committees could not assume this responsibility that would be theirs and see that the cotton farmers of this country would have a record made in order that they may know in future years if such a control program is imposed upon them just what they can depend on.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman's amendment were to prevail, does he have any way of knowing if this work is done that the Department would not be back up here for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation?

Mr. HARRIS. I have no way of knowing that; however, from my investigation a part of the $8,300,000 provided here with $2,500,000 for so-called assistance to national defense program could be utilized for this purpose. What is going to be the nature of the national defense problems that requires $2,500,000 as provided for that purpose for the Department of Agriculture in relation to this agriculture-production program?

Mr. HORAN. In the gentleman's contact with the Department of Agriculture does he have any reason to believe that it would cost more than a million dollars?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. In our conversation I was led to believe that if the Department is given everything that they think they should have, they will have to have new personnel for this purpose and in that instance it would cost about $5,000,000, according to them, but, in my opinion, they can do it with the present personnel supplemented some with the funds as contained in this amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Would the gentleman include language in his amendment so that we could be assured and we could be honest with the Congress or the Committee here?

Mr. HARRIS. I want the gentleman to know that I never intend to be dishonest with the Committee.

Mr. HORAN. I know that.

Mr. HARRIS. Or with the Congress. At the same time I want to be honest with the farmers in this country and try to prevent them from suffering the dilemma they did a year ago.

Mr. HORAN. I was hoping there would be language in there so we would know what we were doing here with such an amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the language speaks for itself. I believe it would be a directive to the Department of Agriculture to carry out this program, to measure the 1951 cotton acreage even though there are no quota controls or allotments in effect. It is for the purpose of having a record.

I hope this amendment is adopted. I believe it is justified and will prove to be necessary. It is not right to force controls on cotton farmers and impose further injustices of reduced allotments by failure to make records at this time when they could be correctly made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted—and by the way I am sympathetic with the situation he describes—that the money, whether it be $1,000,000 or $3,000,000 or whatever amount it might be, must be expended out of this $8,300,000. It seems to me some of the work as described in that particular paragraph which the $8,300,000 was originally put in the bill for must therefore suffer. Just what particular work will suffer I have no idea whatsoever. I would much prefer voting on an amendment, if the gentleman will arrange his amendment in such fashion, limiting such expenditure under his amendment to not over $1,000,000. Then I could personally agree to it. But the door is wide open. This may require $5,000,000, then that will only leave $3,300,000 for all of the work under this particular paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to accept an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman provide the language, and we will offer it? We want to be fair.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman has language to fit, I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not have the time to prepare the language. If the gentleman will put a limitation of $1,000,000 on what he seeks to do, I will be glad to accept the amendment. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent that his amendment be arranged in that fashion? I think the committee will agree to it.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not understand just what the gentleman means with reference to the language he proposes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Arkansas wants to do certain things. He wants the Congress to say that the work of measuring these cotton fields shall be done out of this money. I am agreeable to that if the gentleman will provide in his amendment that not over $1,000,000 of this $8,300,000 is used for that purpose.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to oppose this amendment and I can appreciate the value of having proper historical records, but I hope that the gentleman from Arkansas will accept the suggestion made and add to the amendment that the total cost shall not exceed $1,000,000. I understand that is the suggestion that was made.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman means to add $1,000,000?

Mr. COOLEY. No. Provide that the cotton survey shall not cost to exceed $1,000,000.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified as suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of which will not be to increase any appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct, and I think it is fair to all parties concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. But the cost of which shall not exceed $1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, might I ask what the purpose of it is?

Mr. WHITTEN. It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, in view of the unanimous-consent request, that the amendment be modified as follows: "Including," and then insert "not to exceed $1,000,000 be available for this purpose." That still leaves it coming out of the original figure, but it does say "not to exceed one million."

Mr. WERDEL. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: He says he does not oppose the amendment, or does not want to oppose it. I would like to know just what the purpose of the amendment is.

Mr. WHITTEN. The purpose of the amendment is first, that you now have these controls, and you had them last year on cotton acreage. At that time they had no basis on which to determine what the historical acreage was that was given to the farmers. It is anticipated after this year you have to go back to controls, and you will have no adequate records on which to base your law to go back to the control program this year.

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

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas that the amendment be modified?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 35, line 5, insert after the comma, the following: "including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on the farms whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, providing that not more than $1,000,000 be available for this purpose."

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee some additional questions. As I understand the purpose of the amendment, it is to avoid getting into the condition that we were in last year when, after 8 years of free enterprise in the cotton industry, acreage had moved west and from one part of a State to another part of that State. As I understand the law at the

present time, controls are put on when the formula says they should be put on, and the law at the present time says when that formula does not go into effect, then anyone in the United States can raise cotton. If we want a history during that period of time of free enterprise when the formula is not in effect, somebody who proposes this amendment should tell us what the purpose of that history is when we are operating in free enterprise. If we have such a purpose that we can all agree to, then certainly why should we put into law a provision that a function be entered into by the Department which might cost $50,000,000 and limit it to the expenditure of $1,000,000 without any discussion or understanding of what the actual amount of money necessary should be.

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

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I have talked to a number of Members of Congress on committees, both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture and I have talked to the staff members down at the Department of Agriculture. I have been advised by some here in Congress that it would cost probably $1,000,000 to make a record of the 1951 planted acreage. The Department of Agriculture says if they have to set up a new organization altogether, go out and employ new personnel, a complete new organization, then they would expect it to cost about $5,000,000. That is the reason we think perhaps $1,000,000 would be sufficient at least to start this program.

I will say to the gentleman in answer to his other question that when we had a cotton-acreage allotment program in effect in 1950 it was based on the acreage planted in 1946, 1947, and 1948. I have in my hand the report that was issued insofar as the counties in my district are concerned. The BAE cotton-acreage report for 1946, 1947, and 1948 was one thing. The producers reported cotton acreage in an entirely different amount. The basic allotment by the committee was an entirely different acreage altogether, and the final allotment was another acreage. If we have future allotments that are going to be based on the amount of the preceding 5 years, not counting, of course, 1949, we will have a record for 1950, and the records for 1946, 1947, and 1948 will have been made, whether they are correct or not; but in order to complete it, it will be necessary to have a record for 1951. If we do not have that record, you will have the BAE reporting one thing, you will have the farmers reporting another, and you will have the committees again reporting another. This is for the purpose of having the cotton farmers of the gentleman's State as well as my own, big and little farmers, knowing exactly what they can count on if that record is made.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from California represents the largest cotton-growing county in our State. His opinion on this is good. The gentleman from Arkansas has now raised a new question. He said, "at least for a beginning." It seems to me that does raise the question of how much is involved.

Now I ask the gentleman from California this. As I remember the problem in the very small way it affected my particular district, the problem was not whether the figures were correct or not; it was whether the acreage could follow the farmer. The gentleman from California will also remember that in California a great deal of acreage was allotted to 5-acre plots. We have no 5-acre cotton farms in California. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. WERDEL. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How would the proposal affect that?

Mr. WERDEL. That is one of the things I am trying to find out.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no better way in the world you can preserve that 5-acre block than to have a history made of it so when an allotment is made to California, whatever it will be you will know what it is.

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

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will not object to this request, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] for three additional minutes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, may I take this additional time to say that I understand the purpose of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and I think it should be clear in the RECORD that during these years when controls are not in effect we need a history under the existing law to determine what the allotments should be when they do go into effect. I point out, however, that $1,000,000 is not enough money. If the limitation is on it, it should be increased in the Senate, because it is my recollection that in round numbers there are seven or eight million acres of cotton raised on tracts of 5 acres or less. To try to get the history of that many farms with $1,000,000, each of them having 5 acres or less, is impossible. I point that out to the Committee for its consideration.

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

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think probably the gentleman is right. However, in view of all of the confusion we had heretofore, as well as that which we have had on the floor of the House in regard to this program, I believe there will be a sufficient amount of interest at the farm level to supplement such labor as the department will have to have to procure these accurate measurements. I think this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. WERDEL. But I point out to the gentleman there is less than a dollar per grower here to get that history. We can get more confusion if you have to make a report under such circumstances than we had last time.

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

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Any one man who goes out to take the history can walk out and see the acreage in a few minutes, and find out just how much acreage there is. And you talk about one man to a farm. One man can go out and get the correct allotment in a day for a number of farms, so it would not necessarily be a question of how much money is going to be allocated to one cotton farmer.

Mr. WERDEL. That may be true in Arkansas, but we do not walk that fast in California.

Mr. HARRIS. You know pretty well what you have in your acreage lots out there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think the action of the House, if it takes the course today of adopting this amendment, will go a long way toward alleviating possible confusion and chaos in the future if a program of cotton acreage allotments is set up again. I am sure all of you who have been Members of the House during the past few years are familiar with the great struggles which went on here and the waste of time and various other expensive and costly delays which were occasioned as a result of the confusion which came about when we went into acreage allotments for the first time after being off of them for several years during the war.

Many of the cotton farmers in my district have indicated to me they are willing to finance a large part of this acreage measurement themselves and that it is necessary in order that a clear picture of the acreage history may be preserved. But this provision in the bill, to provide some type of acreage history by the Department, I believe can go a long way toward establishing a fairer and clearer acreage allotment program in the future.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to tell the Members of the House one experience where one cotton farmer claimed that he had so many acres planted for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported an entirely different figure. When he finally brought in his acreage insurance certificate, they then accepted it and gave him what he said he had planted. That was the only way in the world he had of presenting any record whatsoever which they would believe. There was one farmer perhaps out of hundreds and hundreds who had a crop insurance record which they would accept.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is correct. The adoption of this amendment will save the House a lot of headaches in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time, if I may, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] for 6 minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL]. If it is necessary to increase this amount of money in the other body in order to do a fair and just job of work, it certainly should be done, because there never was a situation more chaotic which characterized the small, family-sized farmer, and larger farmers, too, than that which resulted when cotton quotas were again imposed in 1950. A great deal is being said from day to day about short crops. I read in the Washington Post recently about a short wheat crop, and about other grain crops being short. Of course we all know there has been a very short cotton crop in the last season.

One of the signal things that is never mentioned, however, is that one of the reasons for these shortages is that the farm program is having the effect, in instances at least, of driving some people off of the farms.

I have in my possession letters and information which say exactly this, that one of the reasons people are leaving the farms is because of the way in which acreage allotments are handled.

As I have said so many times, and incidentally I have placed many letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to that effect and nobody has ever disputed them, it is a known fact that throughout the South people had to leave the farms because they did not have ample acreage allotted to them to justify remaining there.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to call attention to the fact that a year ago and 2 years ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and others of us called attention to that fact, that as a result thousands left Texas congressional districts and many thousands left western Oklahoma.

Mr. BECKWORTH. One district in my State of Texas alone lost 50,000 people in 10 years according to the last census. Other districts in States close by lost many people. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and I predicted when certain cotton legislation was debated on the floor of the House in August 1949 this would happen. Restrictive legislation was then passed which drove people from the farms and which would not let the war workers who wanted to return to the farms and veterans return. One of the reasons is that when people sought to come back from the war and from defense plants they could not get a farm to work. I have a letter from a man who owns 320 acres of land. He said that he had been penalized $108 for growing one bale of cotton; that he had 3.6 acres. He also had 2.6 acres of peanuts. He said in effect in the letter to me, which was written on April 30, "How can you expect me to obey an order of the Government to undertake to grow more crops when I am being penalized like that this year?"

Much has been said about the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I do not know what the experience of the average Member has been, but that is one section of the Department of Agriculture where it often is rather difficult at times to get information; I suppose they do the best they can. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is correct when he makes the assertion that countless farmers have contended that they had grown so many acres of a given crop over a period of years, when the Bureau of Agricultural Economics simply said, "This is what we have on your account." As for accuracy, in my opinion most of the farmers being honest, knew what they had grown better than the BAE.

I say that this proposition of people leaving the farms, certainly in some sections of the country, is a serious thing. I think if that trend does not cease we are going to see even more shortages. I hope that as the question of shortages develops there will be a few more questions as to what relationship leaving the farm frequently by compulsion, at least indirectly, on the part of people during the last 10 years is having on shortages. I think we might very well afford to study that particular thing. After all, the commercial farmer—and there are commercial farmers—is in business to make all the dollars he can, and when the dollars become scarce he is not going to stay there like the family-sized farmer who likes to farm because he can earn a living at it and because there, too, is attached a certain amount of liberty and freedom that cannot be found in many other vocations. I repeat, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is to be commended for offering this amendment, and I hope that the proper study will be given to it in the Senate, and that ample money will be made available to see that every farmer who wants to farm is given a square deal when the acreage allotments are reimposed. Only can this occur if there are adequate and accurate records.

To show you how confused the Department of Agriculture is on this subject, I wrote a letter to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. McCormick, in which I asked him if allotments are reimposed in 1952 what will happen to farmers who undertake to grow cotton.

He answered me like this, and the letter is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the acreage allotments may be affected a whole lot, or none at all, or somewhere in between.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD certain data:

WINTER WHEAT ESTIMATE DROPS TO SMALLEST CROP SINCE 1943

(By John W. Ball)

The Government Crop Reporting Board yesterday forecast the smallest winter wheat crop since 1943. Between April 1 and May 1 the indicated crops shrank 44,000,000 bushels.

The prospect on May 1, the Board stated, was for only 682,000,000 bushels, compared with 750,000,000 bushels last year (when plantings were restricted by the Government), 902,000,000 bushels in 1949, and 1,007,000,000 bushels in 1948.

The gloomy crop outlook—which, if correct, will lower the 1952 carry-over to only 300,000,000 bushels—is almost certain to stiffen congressional opposition against giving any wheat to India. There already has been some pressure for lending India money and letting it buy the grain elsewhere.

The report clearly indicated that unless there is an unusual spring wheat crop the country this year won't raise enough wheat to meet domestic requirements and already committed exports under the International Wheat Agreement and other agreements. Planting of spring wheat, the report said, has been delayed by wet weather in most areas, but is finally progressing well.

The serious damage to the crop from drought and insect infestation is shown in the following figures: (1) Almost 27 percent of the acreage planted to wheat has been abandoned, compared to average abandonment of 10 percent; (2) yield is predicted at only 16.6 bushels an acre compared with 17.1 last year, 18.8 bushels in 1948, and 19.5 bushels in 1947.

Oats, the report said, are far below normal, averaging only 58 percent compared with 62 percent last May and an average of 71 percent for this time of year.

The report commented that farm work was badly delayed in April. It gave no estimate of the extent of damage due to late planting. It also did not comment on the delay in preparing the soil in the Midwest corn area for corn planting. It mentioned that "seeding of spring grains was delayed in much of the north central region," and then added that "seeding of spring wheat acreage, however, is now probable under fairly favorable conditions."

Spring commercial truck crops have been retarded, with prospects for 5 to 7 percent less than last year. Sharp declines from last year are foreseen for onions, cabbage, and carrots, with smaller declines for nine other vegetables. Increases are forecast in cucumbers, cantaloupes, and spinach.

"Prospects for apples are good in Maryland," the report stated. "The low temperatures during April did little damage to the crop.

"In Virginia the freeze on April 17 to 19 damaged early blooming varieties, especially Delicious. The bloom on most varieties except York has been heavy.

"In West Virginia * * * prospects are for a good crop."

EUSTACE, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*

To Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

Well, Lindy, here I come for some information from you. Now I am asking you. Well they wrote me and said I owed them $108.50 for growing a bale of cotton in 1950 because I did not sign a contract. My allotment is 3.6 acres. Say, I can't live on that small acreage. My peanuts acreage is 2.6 acres. I did not violate God's law growing one bale, as bad as we need it. My tax is so high I can't pay them everything, so high everybody left the farm and went to town to work. I am asking you, do I have to pay that $108.50, or must I ignore it? So give me your opinion on it and answer at once. If I do have to pay for it, I am quitting farming to go to town to work. I can make a better living in town. I am growing peanuts for feed for my cattle. I did not ask the Government for help, and, if I can't grow what I want to on my farm enough to keep it up, there is no need staying on it. So the farmer is so handicapped he can't grow enough anyhow.

So this year they want me to grow all the cotton I can. Trying to fine me for growing one bale in 1950, now what must I do—pay or not?

Now, here is the situation: Now I have 320 acres; my neighbor has 100 acres. He has 37 acres peanut allotment, I have 1 acre. So I am keeping a copy of this letter I am sending you. So tell me, do I have to pay or not? You find out and let me hear from you. I have been your supporter and Truman, too, so, I am trying to support the Government every way I can. My desire is grow something but the —— does not want me to sell it, but by being penalized for it. If you can read this—I am left-handed—so answer as soon as you well can.

T. C. MEWBORNE.

MINEOLA, TEX., *May 1, 1951.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Third Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have decided to write you concerning a problem that concerns not only you and I but our whole Nation.

It is the absentee ownership of land as I have seen it and read about in the State of Texas. I am sure you must have given no little thought to the matter as the decline of population in your district I feel is a definite outgrowth of this evil.

Many reasons for that decline is given by one and another authority but in my opinion the fact that good farms and ranches being as nearly unobtainable as they have become since so many business and professional people and people of means have developed the fad of buying farms as a hobby or else for speculation purposes.

* * * * *

* * * own about 12,000 acres of land composed completely of small farms purchased and assembled into a block operated by one or two hired hands on each three or four thousand acres of land which formerly furnished a living for some 40 to 60 people or rather families.

* * * are just examples, there are numbers more owning hundreds of acres acquired in the same manner, and with hardly an exception these are people that acquired their money in some other manner than farming.

Add to these people the lower income professional people who buy one or two small farms each and the many farms our old folks are living on and not operating and not able to rent or sell under the present administration of our old age pension law and you will see the difficulties faced by a person of moderate means who likes to farm or grow stock and also the reason our population is declining in our rural areas.

Also the ill will toward our Government created by these conditions is of no small import since as I am certain you are aware, the ownership of the majority of land by a few large landowners has always been a matter of disturbance in whatever country it has and is occurring.

This is a State-wide—and probably a Nation-wide—problem as you can readily see by checking the sharp fall in the number of individually owned farms in the State of Texas during the last decade.

Being a man of limited education and experience in such matters I can recommend no pat solution but do feel that through taxes or other means this situation should be remedied for the good of our Nation and its people and especially the future generations.

I am a disabled ex-marine—World War II—sent to the farm by the doctors to find a means of livelihood more suited to my health and after 2 years of renting while trying to find a farm to buy have been made well aware of the situation in east Texas and I hope you will find this whole problem worthy of your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

BARTON S. HILL.

WILLS POINT, TEX., *April 29, 1951.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have been intending to write you for some time in regards to some of the things that are being passed and put on farmers and stockraisers.

First, DiSalle set the ceiling price on cotton at 45 cents and just across the Mexican border, cotton is selling for 85 cents a pound.

I sit here with a Dallas newspaper's headlines on beef prices. To be cut back 10 cents a pound. Still Brannan is asking for 16,000 bales of cotton. This is, as you know, around Wills Point, a cotton and cattle country. Our son, D. L., Jr., and I, are farming 550 acres of land, and farm machinery is up this year about 25 percent above last year. Gasoline is up 2 cents a gallon, but DiSalle, Wilson, and Brannan are doing nothing about it. Fire the hell out of all.

* * * * *

Lindley, we think you are tops, but for God sakes what is wrong up there. Guess by now you will say just another old fogy fool. I was at the cotton meeting in the bank. In regards to cotton allotments last year, Mr. Curtis asked me to state my allotment and acreage which I did, and I do want to tell you. I, my wife, and son did appreciate what you did in getting the cotton allotment raised.

Lindley, in 1940, D. L., Jr., and I, ginned 74 bales of cotton; in 1950, we ginned 37 bales, 14,000 pounds of vetch, 600 bushels of corn. After expenses were paid, we did not pay income tax, for expenses got it all. Still the farmer makes it all.

Your friend,

DAVE FULLER.

Mr. Chairman, farmers in my section have been told to go to raising cattle. Some of them tried to do so. Note their problems in the enclosed letters:

PITTSBURG, TEX., *May 5, 1951.*

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: After reading the attached article in the Wichita Daily Times, April 29, 1951, Wichita Falls, Tex., I have learned that it is the intention of the Office of Price Stabilization to roll back the price of beef received by the producers 18 percent by October 1951.

I am not a cattle king, and it is not my intent to become a cattle baron, but I am one of the many small producers of beef cattle who would like to have a decent return on the money and time I have invested in this enterprise.

To go further into detail, I will give you the following facts relative to my operation:

I have 108 acres in Camp and Upshire Counties and I use 211 acres in Franklin County, ownership being in the family. These two farms are ordinary east Texas farms and I judge worth $11,000. The two farms are stocked with 48 cows and 2 bulls. These cows are common cows, most of them of Hereford type, with an occasional Angus, Shorthorn, or brindle cow. My bulls are Hereford and from considerably better stock than the cows. These cows are worth a minimum of $10,000.

As you will know, from your past experience, a certain amount of costly equipment is necessary in order for an organization of this type to function. These items will include a pick-up truck, wire stretchers, lariat ropes, all sorts of hand tools and shovels, etc. I believe that allowing $2,000 for this expense is not excessive. In addition, $1,000 is needed to take care of any overhead.

The annual calf crop to be expected will run about 80 percent, therefore I expect to sell around 40 calves annually from my 48 cows at April 25, 1951, prices. These calves when sold at 9 or 10 months of age would average about $100 each, or $4,000.

Expenses during the year for feed, automobile expenses and maintenance of fences and buildings alone will certainly amount to $1,000 each year, leaving a net expected return of $3,000.

If we, the producers, are cut back 18 percent as proposed by OPS, then my income will be reduced 18 percent of $4,000, which is $720. This amount deducted from my net income of $3,000 will leave only $2,280.

I believe and I think that you will agree that a return of $2,280 for 1 year's work and a $24,000 investment is entirely too little under current conditions. I also believe that this proposed OPS roll-back is unjustified and is discriminatory against the producer of beef cattle, when other expenses are not rolled back proportionately.

Any assistance or information you may be able to give will certainly be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

W. REX SPENCER.

PITTSBURG, TEX., *April 2, 1951.*

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

DEAR SIR: I am a small farmer with a few cattle, with high-priced feed and higher wages would make an awful hard go, with cattle prices cut back.

Our cattle have been raised on high-priced feed. If the cut-back comes, I don't see anything to do except quit producing cattle.

I hope we can get some relief and am asking you to do what you can to help us cattle growers.

Very respectfully,

H. M. MELTON.

Note the answers again. I fear these small livestock growers, like the small farmers, are faced with very serious problems which could result in shortages.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your expressed interest in behalf of Mr. W. Rex Spencer, rural route 5, box 12, Pittsburg, Tex., who has objected to the control of meat prices.

On January 26, 1951, the Office of Price Stabilization issued the General Ceiling Price Regulation, which froze prices of processors and distributors at levels prevailing December 19, 1950 to January 25, 1951. This price freeze was issued on the decision that definite action was necessary to put the breaks on inflation.

During the week of June 24, 1950, immediately prior to the start of the Korean situation, the weekly average price of prime cattle at Chicago as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture was $31.42 per hundredweight. During the week of April 21, 1951, the weekly average price of prime cattle had reached $40.88 per hundredweight and the dressed carcass price was $59.70. This was in the period when cattle was in large supply. Due to this rapid rise in prices, it has been found necessary to control the price of beef because it is such an important item in our economy.

Although the average prices paid to farmers for beef cattle on January 26, 1951, had increased considerably, these prices were not frozen by the General Ceiling Price Regulation because there was no effective grading service available at the time. When the regulation was issued, however, this office stated that controls on livestock prices would be announced later. By April 15, prices of prime grade steers were 30 percent above those in June 1950. Choice grade steers were up 26 percent.

The ceiling price regulation on beef cattle will leave cattle prices at about the level prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951, or about 10 percent below recent high

levels. These ceiling prices, as reflected at the slaughter level, are 14 to 18 percent higher than the prices paid cattlemen in June of last year.

The price freeze issued last January froze prices which retailers, wholesalers, and slaughterers could charge for beef but did not, however, freeze prices at which the producers of live animals could sell their cattle. Live cattle were exempted because the Office of Price Stabilization recognized that a freeze applied without previous notice would result in a severe hardship to cattle feeders. In order to make it possible for cattle feeders to adjust their operations, the Director of Price Stabilization announced at the time of the January price freeze that ceilings on livestock prices would be issued later. Also, in the price ceilings which were announced on April 30, the adjustments in live cattle prices are made gradually and the adjustments in prices are taken in three different steps so that time will be allowed for cattle feeders to govern their transactions accordingly.

The reductions which will be effective July 29 and September 30 will leave beef cattle prices up to 7 percent above those of last June or between 120 to 125 percent of parity. Department of Agriculture estimates of production costs indicate that under these established ceiling prices, the producers will make a reasonable profit and maintain present level of beef cattle numbers.

It is felt, therefore, that the relationship of these prices to other farm commodities will be such as to be an incentive for a continuing high production of beef. You may be assured that this part of the stabilization program will be periodically reviewed, in order that any changes warranted by facts can be made so that the program will be more effective.

Very truly yours,

KARL K. BECHTOLD,
Office of the Special Assistant to the Director.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your expressed interest in behalf of Mr. H. M. Melton, rural route 5, box 12, Pittsburg, Tex., who has objected to the control of meat prices.

On January 26, 1951, the Office of Price Stabilization issued the General Ceiling Price Regulation, which froze prices of processors and distributors at levels prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951. This price freeze was issued on the decision that definite action was necessary to put the brakes on inflation.

During the week of June 24, 1950, immediately prior to the start of the Korean situation, the weekly average price of prime cattle at Chicago as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture was $31.42 per hundredweight. During the week of April 21, 1951, the weekly average price of prime cattle had reached $40.88 per hundredweight, and the dressed carcass price was $59.70. This was in the period when cattle was in large supply. Due to this rapid rise in prices, it has been found necessary to control the price of beef because it is such an important item in our economy.

Although the average prices paid to farmers for beef cattle on January 26, 1951, had increased considerably, these prices were not frozen by the General Ceiling Price Regulation because there was no effective grading service available at the time. When the regulation was issued, however, this office stated that controls on livestock prices would be announced later. By April 15, prices of prime grade steers were 30 percent above those in June 1950. Choice grade steers were up 26 percent.

The ceiling price regulation on beef cattle will leave cattle prices at about the level prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951, or about 10 percent below recent high levels. These ceiling prices, as reflected at the slaughter level, are 14 to 18 percent higher than the prices paid cattlemen in June of last year.

The price freeze issued last January froze prices which retailers, wholesalers, and slaughterers could charge for beef but did not, however, freeze prices at which the producers of live animals could sell their cattle. Live cattle were exempted because the Office of Price Stabilization recognized that a freeze applied without previous notice would result in a severe hardship to cattle feeders. In order to make it possible for cattle feeders to adjust their operations, the Director of Price Stabilization announced at the time of the January price freeze that ceilings on livestock prices would be issued later. Also, in the price ceilings which were announced on April 30, the adjustments in live cattle prices are made gradually and the adjustments in prices are taken in three different steps so that time will be allowed for cattle feeders to govern their transactions accordingly.

The reductions, which will be effective July 29 and September 30, will leave beef cattle prices up to 7 percent above those of last June or between 120 to 125 percent of parity. Department of Agriculture estimates of production costs indicate that under these established ceiling prices, the producers will make a reasonable profit and maintain present level of beef cattle numbers.

It is felt, therefore, that the relationship of these prices to other farm commodities will be such as to be an incentive for a continuing high production of beef. You may be assured that this part of the stabilization program will be periodically reviewed, in order that any changes warranted by facts can be made so that the program will be more effective.

Very truly yours,

KARL K. BECHTOLD,
Office of the Special Assistant to the Director.

Mr. Chairman, it is unwise and dangerous in my opinion to permit segments of the farm program and certain governmental orders to have the effect of forcing people off the farm or out of the stock-raising business. I have opposed and do oppose this being done. I repeat what I have said before, I am for free enterprise on the farm just as I am for free enterprise in business.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to questions which you raised in our telephone conversation of November 27, and also in reply to your letter of November 27, 1950, regarding what might happen to a particular county's cotton-acreage allotment and the allotments for individual farms within the county, if cotton-acreage allotments should be required in 1952.

In our letter of November 24, 1950, we outlined the present provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, that would probably cause 1952 State and county cotton-acreage allotments, if required, to vary from those established in 1950—in many cases the difference would be substantial—even if no change is made in the national acreage allotment in 1952 from 1950. This is true because of changes in base periods and in formulas provided in the act for apportioning the national allotment to States and the State acreage allotments to counties. We have also discussed with you in previous letters that the provisions of the act do not include the acreage planted to cotton in 1951 in the base for establishing 1952 State and county allotments and, therefore, will not affect them.

Since farm cotton-acreage allotments are determined primarily on a uniform county percentage of cropland, the acreage planted to cotton on a farm has little bearing on the allotment. The law provides that the acreage of cotton be used in determining minimum and maximum allotments in distributing the county allotment—less the acreage reserved by the county committee—to eligible cotton farms. Therefore, if all farmers in a county should double their cotton acreage in 1951 over 1950, the 1952 farm allotments may be changed considerably or none at all or somewhere between, depending on how farmers in the particular county vary their cotton acreage in proportion to cropland.

In view of the many factors affecting allotments as provided by law it is impossible to determine what the 1952 county and farm cotton-acreage allotments would be, is required, until the provisions of the act have been applied in determining State, county, and farm allotments. Consequently, even though we assume that (1) there will be cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas in 1952, (2) the national allotment for 1952 would be the same as the 1950 national allotment, and (3) a particular farm or county plants exactly twice as much cotton in 1951 as was planned in 1950 it would still be impossible to determine the changes in any given county allotment or the farm allotments within a given county.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I include several letters about peanuts and cotton:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Wellington, Tex., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 16, 1950, with reference to the peanut-acreage allotment for our country:

1. We have 109 farms with peanut allotments.
2. Producers in general should have at least 15 acres per farm in order to grow them economically.
3. There are 78 farms in the county that have an allotment of less than 15 acres.
4. We have 15 farms with less than 2-acre allotments.
5. All farms with less than 2-acre allotments will cease to grow peanuts.
6. Probably none of these producers will cease to farm for themselves, but will have to grow other crops for a livelihood.
7. We have 21 producers who applied for new-grower allotments.
8. A total of 27.3 acres were allotted to new growers of this county by the State committee.
9. On an average each new grower received 1.3 acres.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quincy, Fla., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 12, 1950, we have 175 peanut producers in Gadsden County. The least number of acres a farmer can grow economically is usually 5 acres; 89 of these allotments are under 5 acres; 39 received less than 2 acres. Nearly all of these will quit growing peanuts for harvest. We have no way of knowing how many farmers will cease to farm for themselves on this account. It will cause some to do so. Seventeen new

growers applied for peanut acreage this year—1950. We have 17.4 acres to distribute to them. These range from 0.5 to 1.7 acres.

Trusting this is the information you desired, I am,

Yours truly,

BERNARD H. CLARK,
Administrative Officer, Gadsden County, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Giddings, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 15 and we herewith enclose the following information:

1. Number of peanut farms in Lee County: 1,054.
2. The least number a farmer can afford to grow: 10.
3. Number of producers receiving allotments less than the above: 661.
4. Number of producers receiving allotments less than 2 acres: 174.
5. Number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts (approximate): 50.
6. Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (approximate): 25.
7. Number of producers who applied for new grower allotment, 1950: 72.
8. Number of acres to distribute to them: 109.7.
9. Approximate acreage for each new grower: 1.5.

Very truly yours,

WARREN D. MOODY,
Secretary, Lee County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter, dated May 13, 1950, to the Wood County PMA Committee.

We have approximately 400 peanut producers in the county. The least number of acres each producer can afford to grow is 2 acres. We have about 150 producers who received allotments of less than 2 acres. Of those growers having allotments of less than 2 acres, there will be about 25 or 50 who will cease to grow peanuts. I do not believe there will be any cease to farm for themselves. The number of new producers were 35 and the number of acres distributed was 21.4 acres and the average to each was 0.6 of an acre.

The excess acreage (for soil) up to the 1947 picked and threshed will help at least 150 or 200 producers in Wood County.

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Allendale, S. C., June 1, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am listing below the information requested in your letter dated May 18, 1950:

1. What is the least number of acres an average farmer can afford to grow or economically grow: 5.
2. How many producers received allotments less than the number of acres shown in 1: 135.
3. How many peanut producers received allotments less than 2 acres: 76.
4. Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: 50 percent.
5. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.
6. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage this year (1950): 9.
7. How many acres were distributed to them: 18.6.
8. Approximately how much did each receive: 2.

Very truly yours,

HENRY B. BARKER,
County Administrative Officer, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter of April 5, 1950, to the county committee.

(1) The number of farmers receiving 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248. (2) The number of new producers that applied for allotments were 340. (3) The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300. (4) Each producer received from 1 to 1.1 acres. (5) The number of zero allotments were 10. (6) The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 88 percent (300) applications.

The number applications left from item 2 less item 5, less item 6, consisted of 30 applications that did not meet the necessary eligibility requirements.

If you desire further information, please advise.

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Cross City, Fla., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third Congressional District of Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of May 12 relative to peanut producers in Dixie County, Fla. Dixie County is primarily a livestock county and most of the farmers produce peanuts for hog feed. However, we do have some 20 farmers who grow peanuts for digging. Of these 18 have less than 2 acres allotment. It is the general thinking of the average farmer that they cannot economically dig and pick less than 5 acres. Of the number of farmers having less than 2 acres allotments none will cease growing peanuts but about 75 percent of them will not dig. We had no new producers applying for acreage this year but the reason for this was that when told the probable size of new grower allotments those that were interested decided that it would not be worth the trouble of filling out the forms.

Trusting that this is the information that you desire, I am,

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE L. DICKINSON,
County Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burnet, Tex., May 29, 1950.

To: Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

From: Raby A. Alford, secretary, Burnet County PMA.

Subject: Information requested in letter of May 13, 1950.

Information as requested is listed below:

What is the least number of acres average peanut producer can afford to grow: 5.

How many producers received allotments less than acreage mentioned above: 7.

How many of your peanut farmers received allotments of less than 2 acres: 2.

How many of this number (receiving allotments of less than 2 acres) will cease to grow peanuts: 2.

How many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in 1950: 2.

How many acres did you distribute to them: 4.7.

Approximately how much did each receive: 1.5 and 3.2.

OFFICE OF 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,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burbaw, N. C., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of May 18, 1950. The following is a list of the questions and answers requested in your letter:

1. The number of peanut producers in Pender County: 335.
2. Number of acres of peanuts a producer can grow economically: 5.
3. Number of allotments less than 5 acres in county: 185.
4. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres: 56.
5. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres which will not be planted: None.
6. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.
7. Number of producers who applied for new allotments in Pender County in 1950: 11.
8. How many acres did we have to distribute to them? We did not have any acreage to distribute to them as the distribution of acreage is done in Raleigh for new growers.
9. How many acres did the new growers receive in Pender County: 3.

Very truly yours,

T. W. GARRISS,
Secretary, Pender County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Henrietta, Tex., June 1, 1950.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: There are 42 peanut producers in Clay County. About 3 acres is the least number of acres a farmer can afford to grow. There were 13 producers in this county that received allotments of less than the 3 acres mentioned above. There were six producers that received allotments of less than 2 acres. Peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, will cease to grow peanuts commercially but will grow some for home use. None will cease to farm for themselves. There were 13 new producers that applied for peanut acreage in Clay County in 1950. New grower reserves were retained in the State office. All new growers received a total of 13.4 acres.

Yours truly,

ERMON D. WILLIAMS,
Secretary, Clay County PMA.

[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 oved by designating last springs' "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 Le Flore 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 cases, 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 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, Legislative 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, vol. 96, pt. 8, p. 11147	170	95	162	0	0
R. J. Arnold, ibid	76	5	4	0	0
T. Shelby Oakes, ibid., p. 11148	272	5.5	15	0	0
Buell E. Wright, ibid	266	50-60	[1] 146	20	[1] 53
Bert N. Brumfield, ibid	154	10	15	([3])	([3])
Murphy J. Burch, ibid	444	25	111	2	9
R. E. Hoffman, ibid., p. 11149	186	25	47	10	19
Ray S. McEntire, ibid	60	75	45	0	0
F. W. Bolin and C. Riley Brown, ibid	191	15	28	52	100
Woodrow W. Booth, ibid	300	50	150	0	0
E. N. McCall, ibid	478	52	250	5	24
S. C. Plott, ibid., pp. 11149-11150	226	10	22	11	25
A. H. Miller, ibid., p. 11150	408	60	245	2	8
M. L. Bostick, ibid	600	8	50	0	0
Green, Fred J., ibid	43	58	25	0	0
Bernard H. Clark, ibid	12	66	8	0	0
Fred K. Roberts, ibid	540	19	100	5	25
T. W. Garriss, ibid	267	9	25	0	0
G. R. Fulbright, ibid., p., 11151	940	11	100	([4])	([4])
R. O. Fearrington, ibid	857	25	214	([4])	([4])
Mallie Stott, ibid	1,389	11	[5] 150	14	20
W. P. House, ibid	1,151	13	150	([4])	([4])
F. W. Young, ibid	258	50	129	0	0
T. G. Norris, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 11, p. 15610	628	11	70	0	0
Vernon L. Whittle, ibid	345	22	75	58	200
Herman L. Hales, ibid	943	5	47	2	19
C. Howard Treece, ibid., pp. 15610-15611	204	8	16	0	0
O. W. Barnett, ibid., p. 15611	202	10	20	([4])	([4])
J. D. Stephens, ibid	288	5	15	4	12
Ray A. Waters, ibid	84	20	17	5	4
Arthur R. Johnson, ibid	367	25	92	0	0
Billy H. Reynolds, ibid	30	67	20	17	5
Lealdon Smith, ibid., p. 15612	138	0	0	0	0
Max G. Sallings, ibid	100	1	1	2	2
William M. Belcher, ibid	35	29	10	0	0
Carl E. Teeter (Maricopa County) also, for the State of Arizona, ibid. (letter to Hon. Murdock)	55 185	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
J. A. Sorenson, ibid., p. 15613	8	50	4	25	2
Robert E. Turner, ibid	282	18	50	0	0
Emory Hunt, ibid	172	35	60	6	10
Fred W. Barber, ibid., pp. 15613-15614	157	32	50	([6])	([7])
Clayton A. Burriss, ibid., p. 15614	168	26	43	12	20
Roy F. Jones, ibid	38	66	25	13	5
R. V. Richey, ibid	84	30	25	([4])	([4])
John A. King, ibid	81	75	61	0	0
Frank Wells, ibid., p. 15615	140	25	35	([4])	([4])
T. M. Minchew, ibid	393	25	100	0	0
W. H. Huddleston, ibid	63	32	20	16	10
Alex Long, ibid	52	15	8	5	3
Joe B. Moran, ibid	75	20	15	5	4
B. P. McWhirter, ibid	108	25	27	0	0
John L. Binendine, ibid., p. 15616	76	10	8	0	0
Ranell Lowman, ibid	51	50	26	10	5
Marion M. Shivers, ibid	132	50	66	([4])	([4])
Q. D. Wilson, ibid	473	5	25	0	0
Roy L. O'Brien, ibid	114	22	25	13	15
E. D. Dixon, ibid	138	5	7	([4])	([4])
John L. Hays, ibid., p. 15617	1	0	0	0	0
James B. Stewart, ibid	18	0	0	0	0
Berto J. Ourso, ibid	162	31	50	0	0
Hugh G. Edgerton, ibid	32	97	31	0	0
John H. George, ibid., p. 15618	306	10-15	40	([4])	([4])
Waldo P. O'Neal, ibid	96	26	25	0	0
Laura Mae Hammer, ibid	4	100	4	25	1
Alvara B. Nance, ibid., p. 15619	18	44	8	17	3
Bill E. Fisher, ibid	56	50	28	0	0
A. B. Duke, ibid	154	25-30	43	([5])	([9])
U. Ozel Cox, ibid	80	0	0	None	None
Gus Harris, ibid., p. 15620	670	7.5	50	3.7	25
Anonymous, ibid	170	23.5	40	11.7	20
De Kalb County PMA Committee, ibid	95	31.6	30	None	None
Jack Collins, ibid	116	15	17	None	None
F. K. Wright, ibid	34	21	7	None	None
Charles E. Kell, ibid	16	10	2	10	2
G. B. Fowler, ibid., p. 15621	1,146	22	250	([4])	([4])
B. T. Lake, ibid	350	5	18	5	18
F. W. Young, ibid	258	50	129	0	0
W. W. Hankins, Jr., ibid	12	0	0	0	0
Lucille A. Bass, ibid., p. 15622	15	0	0	0	0
W. P. House, ibid	1,151	13	150	([4])	([4])
George H. Carter, ibid., p. 15762	12	0	0	0	0
Cline T. Young, ibid., p. 15763	157	30	47	10	16
P. L. Barksdale, ibid	192	8	15	0	0
Carl E. Lively, ibid	129	9	11	([4])	([4])
C. H. Teal, ibid., p. 15765	1	100	1	0	0

[1] Approximate.
[2] Very small percentage.
[3] Very small number.
[4] Not given.
[5] Estimated.
[6] Not given.
[7] Very few.
[8] Small percentage.
[9] A 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
Alva E. Sanders, ibid	264	19	50	38	100
Demp Kearney, ibid., p. 15766	7	100	[5] 7	0	0
James M. Ratliff, ibid	56	35.7	20	0	0
A. J. Peters, ibid	115	75	86	[5]	6
Bennett P. Haman, ibid., p. 15768	33	0	0	.5	0
H. R. Hill ibid., p. 15769	250	10	25	30-40	88
T. Shelby Oakes, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 8, p. 11428	272	6	15	0	0
Summary: Number of allotments	22,145	20	4,453	4	878

[5] Estimated.

Source: Letters to Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1931, 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 adaptations to meet local conditions, such a requirement would advance the over-all 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.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICUTURE,
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. MCCORMACK,
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. Nixen should arrange to meet with his local PMA 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that this amendment be adopted. It does not add anything to the over-all expenditure. I state, however, that the $1,000,000 is a limitation on the appropriation, but in my opinion the farmers feel so strongly about this that the farmers at least in my territory would be glad to contribute part of the cost, if necessary.

Another point in favor of having this measuring done is that there is a probability of more confusion than there was the last time controls were imposed. I might say, incidentally, that when inequities do occur it usually affects the small farmer to a greater extent for he does not keep the complete records that the larger farmer does.

I think that in order to protect the small farmer we should have this acreage measured, because we all do know that we are going to have limitations and crop controls put on in some future year, and I think it is very important that we do authorize this work to be done.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to make clear in reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], that I am not in agreement to furnishing any more money than is in the fund now when I agreed that $1,000,000 of this $8,300,000 be expended for this purpose. I am supporting the amendment on that basis, but I want it to appear in the RECORD that I am not suggesting that we go over to the Senate and get this $8,300,000 increased.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In this amendment here we are not asking any additional money at this time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is right and that is my reason for agreeing to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, another reason not heretofore advanced in this debate for adoption of this amendment is that the individual farmers are entitled to a better record than those afforded by BAE figures, which are based upon inaccurate gin reports and poor estimations. Cotton acreage is often afforded a county, based upon gin records, to which the county is not entitled. In such instances the acreage has been wrongfully taken from another county. There are many reasons why gin reports cannot be considered as good estimates. Some acreage in the same field will produce considerably more cotton than adjoining acreage.

It is not the large farmer who is so adversely affected without actual cotton acreage records; because as has been brought out here before, it is not difficult for him to prove the exact number of acres that he had planted to cotton; it is the small cotton farmer, the one-horse cotton farmer, so to speak, who is drastically affected.

Since it now appears that no Member will oppose the amendment, I will only take enough additional time to state that actual cotton acreage records should be established during these years that no controls are in force in order that every farmer may know his entitlement in case of future controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to conclude the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for time; I did not understand that any time was reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); $300,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of receipts from Farm Credit agencies, to be advanced to this appropriation, to cover the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,625,000.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to briefly discuss an item under the Farm Credit Administration program which was quite severely cut by the committee. I am not going to offer an amendment to increase the amount, but I do want to call the attention of the committee to the fact the entire cut which is made in the Farm Credit Administration appropriation of $280,000 falls on one division of the Farm Credit Administration, the cooperative research and service organization. That item as it came from the budget called for $580,000 and it has been reduced by the committee to $300,000 or a cut of about 48 percent. I do not know how familiar the membership may be with the work which has been done by the cooperative research and service organization, but I want to briefly call attention to the history of that organization and refer to the work it has done.

The Cooperative Research and Service Division was set up under the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926. The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 which set up the Federal Farm Board was largely based upon the cooperative marketing of farm products, and under its provisions additional duties were assigned to this Division. During the intervening years it has rendered splendid service to farmers' cooperative organizations, especially the local cooperatives which comprise 9,500 of the 10,000 farm marketing and purchasing cooperatives in this country. These local cooperatives are composed in the main of operators of family farms and the Division's work and activity has been to assist these farmers to utilize cooperatives in meeting their farm-business problems, particularly in the marketing of their products.

I am a strong believer in the value of these local cooperatives which have done much to equalize the family farmers' competitive position. In assisting them we are helping farmers to help themselves, and the total amount of money appropriated throughout the years for this agency amounts to practically nothing when compared with the over-all appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

While I do not intend to offer an amendment to restore this amount, I would like to call attention to the fact that this cut of 48 percent is one of the most severe in the bill and compares with a reduction of approximately 10 percent in the other research funds of the Department. I believe that the value of this research to farmers compares most favorably with that of the other research activities of the Department and feel that if 10 percent is considered a fair reduction in the appropriations for other research activities that no greater percentage should be applied to this item.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We all recognize the fact that as we go through the innumerable items contained in this bill perhaps the committee does make mistakes one way or the other. I am referring now to the action of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Here is one item in the bill that we may have cut too deeply. I have suggested to gentlemen who have approached me on this subject that they make their case before the other body, and then we can discuss the matter further in conference if the other body decides to increase what we have allowed here.

Mr. HOPE. I thank my good friend very much. I am entirely agreeable to the suggestion which he has just made. I know that if there is further opportunity to consider the matter he will approach it in his usual spirit of fairness and will consider the question from the able and sympathetic viewpoint in which he deals with all legislative problems.

I hope that the cooperative organizations which are interested will go before the Senate committee and make out their case, and if the Senate does increase the amount that the members of the conference committee will be inclined to give consideration to that increase on its merits.

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say that sometimes in the heat of discussion we frequently overlook some things, but I want to say that there is no abler man in the House of Representatives than the gentleman from Kansas, and there is no man in the Congress that I know who knows more about the operation of agriculture and who gives a fairer approach to the subject than the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the confidence that the membership generally has in the gentleman is not exceeded by what they have in anybody else in the House, and I am glad to have this statement on this particular issue presented. As I have said many times, we cannot vouch for the accuracy of these decisions but we can give reasons. In regard to this particular item, all of the activities of the Farm Credit Administration are done for various members of the Farm Credit System, but in each case the charges are assessed back to the organization. It is only in regard to the cooperatives that the entire cost is paid by appropriation out of the Treasury. No charge is made to them for any of the work. The Farm Credit Administration provides the co-ops with professional and technical assistance, research facilities, and so on. The purpose of the committee, insofar as I understand it, was that we thought in regard to cooperatives it might be wise for them to begin to contribute to some extent toward the cost of these services, since in regard to all other services, all the charges are paid by member organizations. That has been the position of the committee. Certainly there is no prejudice on the part of the committee. If the amount of the cut is too severe, we will be glad to reconsider it. But, in view of the very fine attitude and the confidence I have in the gentleman from Kansas, I wanted to explain our position and say that we will be glad at any time to go into the matter with anyone who may have a different idea about it.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi most sincerely for his kind references. I appreciate them, especially coming from him. I am glad also to have the information which the gentleman gives me with respect to what the committee had in mind in reducing this appropriation. While I realize that the other expenditures of the Farm Credit Administration are paid for by assessments against the lending institutions under its supervision, I do not believe that such a rule could very well be applied to this activity. In the first place it is generally conceded that agricultural research activities are general in their scope and cannot very well be charged against any particular group or organization. That is true of all of our research activities as far as I know. In the second place this activity is quite similar to studies made by the Department of Commerce for business and industry which are made out of appropriated funds. In the third place the chief beneficiaries of this work have been the small local cooperatives which are not in a position to pay for this service even if some equitable method of apportioning the charges could be worked out. For these and other reasons I do not believe that the suggestion which has been made that this work be compensated for by cooperative organizations is a proper or a practical approach to the matter.

Let me report that because I have such great confidence in this subcommittee, which has brought in a splendid bill, I am simply calling attention to this situation with the thought that the cooperative organizations which are interested in this service will appear before the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I believe they can make a strong case for an increase above the amount carried in the House bill. In the event that the item is increased by the Senate I feel certain that the distinguished chairman and the other members of the House subcommittee will give the matter due and proper consideration. That is all I ask.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the deduction of $280,000 from the $580,000 portion of the funds appropriated for the Farm Credit Administration, proposed by the House Appropriations Committee, falls entirely on the Cooperative Research and Service Division of that agency.

There has been no criticism of the manner in which the staff of the Division has discharged its duties through the years. On the contrary, it has had many words of commendation from officers of farmers' cooperatives and Members of Congress. Neither has the Division expended any great amount of public funds. Its budget request for this year is only $580,000 compared with many millions approved for other agricultural programs of no greater importance than assistance to self-help organizations such as cooperatives.

The heavy cut of 48 percent for research for farmer cooperatives is out of all proportion to the statement of the House Committee Report that research funds in the Department should "under existing circumstances, be reduced by approximately 10 percent." A reasonable cut could be borne, but this cut would impair the ability of the Farm Credit Administration to carry out its basic functions in helping farmers with their cooperatives.

The statement of the committee appears to be predicated on a misunderstanding of the program of the Cooperative Research and Service Division. It is not a service agency for individual cooperatives or for other divisions of the Farm Credit Administration. Its research is generally of a broad character, and the results are useful to all cooperatives performing the functions studied, and to non-cooperatives as well. Only a part of the work of the Division during the past year was devoted to service activities for cooperatives. The remainder was research on the common problems of many cooperatives, other producers and distributors on service and educational work, a small part of the total with groups of farmers planning organization, or with small cooperatives with little financial strength.

The great majority of farmer cooperatives are small, local organizations. Perhaps 500 marketing and purchasing associations could be classified as large-scale; that is, their net worth is $1,000,000 or more. The other 9,500, for the most part, have no more than enough working capital to carry on their business operations.

Even assuming that cooperatives could pay part of the cost of research service, there is no machinery under which such funds could be collected. This would require special legislation and it would take a considerable period to work out any program to help continue the work of the agency under this basis. In the meantime, the staff would be scattered and the trained personnel now available would be gone, as there are no funds to carry on this work other than those provided by the appropriation.

The proposed cut of 48 percent for research, service, and educational work for cooperatives operated by farmers would be in opposition to the long record of Congresses favorable to helping farmers to help themselves, and to the preservation of the family-farm type of agriculture which we hold basis to our democratic economic and social system.

This list of functions is illustrative of the tasks performed, but is not all-inclusive, even though it covers a wide range of activities. Staff members of the division were able to directly assist the agencies of Government on special problems confronting cooperatives, or provide information on cooperative operations of direct assistance to the war agencies.

The first group of functions includes those aiding the war effort directly:

At the request of General Arnold, head of the Army Air Corps, the livestock and wool section of the division organized State shearing committees who assisted in attaining an annual production of 5,000,000 shearlings to make flying suits for military aviators.

In cooperation with State extension services and cooperative associations, the division set up schools in 17 States to train sheep shearers, mostly from future farmer and 4-H Clubs, who replaced a large number of regular sheep shearers who were inducted into the Armed Forces.

Surveyed wool-storage facilities at eastern points to determine space available for storage of wool stockpile.

At the request of Gen. Theron T. Weaver, of the War Department, hide-conservation schools at 20 packing plants over the country were conducted to train unskilled butchers in order to reduce cuts and scars on hides as a part of the leather-conservation program.

Conducted experiments in baling wool with cotton presses to demonstrate the amount of saving which could be made in burlap and transportation space by shipment in bales rather than in bags.

Gave assistance in the organization of agricultural transportation pools and National, State, and county transportation committees.

Assembled comparative freight rates and factual transportation information to determine most advantageous locations for grain storage and distributing facilities.

Assisted in the allocation of materials for the manufacture of new equipment and repair of needed rail, highway, and waterway equipment for the transportation of agricultural products and farm supplies.

Submitted a traffic program for conservation of tires, delivery equipment, and labor in moving farm supplies to farmers to the Department of Agriculture Committee on Conservation of Trucks and Tires for Agricultural Transportation.

A study was made of methods used by purchasing cooperatives to help farmers conserve their farm machinery and equipment during the war emergency.

Considerable effort was devoted to work with the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations on plans to conserve rubber and other scarce materials through more efficient assembling of milk and cream.

Early in World War II, the importance of adequate supplies of fats and oils was recognized. Because of previous studies and knowledge of the industry, the division was asked to make a national survey of the crushing capacity and location of oil mills in the United States. The results of this study made it possible to use existing capacity far more efficiently.

Work in the manpower field included studies of the possibilities of using manpower more efficiently in processing plants, study of labor relations in these plants, participation in training-within-industry programs for cooperatives jointly sponsored by the War Manpower Commission and banks for cooperatives. Attention was given to problems of employee recruitment, replacement, deferment, and wages.

Worked with cooperative associations to increase the efficiency of milk assembly by trucks.

Surveyed the possibilities for dehydration of fruits and vegetables by cooperatives and assisted cooperatives in developing dehydration operations as a part of the war effort.

Information was prepared on methods of training cooperatives' employees for wartime efficiency.

Specific, detailed studies were made of cooperatives to develop ways for them to meet war conditions, and to determine how they might make the greatest contribution to the war effort. These detailed works were conducted in Alabama, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Kansas, Idaho, Washington, the Tennessee Valley Authority area, and the fifth farm credit district.

Secured gasoline, tires, and trucks for sheep-shearing crews in the West and Middle West when these items were originally denied by OPA.

Secured steel for the manufacture of sheep-shearing machines and blades after the commercial companies manufacturing these items had failed to secure an allocation of steel from the War Production Board.

The second group of functions includes those aiding in the war effort by giving direct assistance to agencies of the Government:

Assisted in bringing to the attention of selective-service officials contributions to the war effort of key employees of cooperatives in connection with their possible deferment.

The Frozen Food Locker Section was designated as the sole agency in the Department of Agriculture to pass on applications for new construction and expansion of locker plants, and to make recommendations to the WPB regarding allocations.

Furnished cost, margin, and price data to the OPA and wartime agencies relative to poultry products.

At the request of the Office of Agricultural War Relations studies were made and reports prepared on the estimated numbers and kinds of new containers and material needed for fresh fruits and vegetables in 1942, new and second-hand bags necessary for storage and shipment of raw sugar produced in 1943, and fabrics required for bags and other packaging for agricultural products and for farm supplies in 1942.

Assisted the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations on problems of packaging requirements for feed and fertilizer.

Prepared price and other related information on certain fertilizer materials for the Department of Labor and Office of Price Administration.

Served on a USDA subcommittee charged with developing a rationing program for nitrogen fertilizer.

Assistance was given to UNRRA and various agencies in the USDA on problems relating to cooperative purchasing of farm supplies.

At the request of the Surplus Marketing Administration, the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations, the Office of Production Management, the Dairy Section made studies to determine the economic soundness of establishing milk plants to be financed with lend-lease funds.

Representatives of the Dairy Section of the Division served on the committees establishing production goals for the dairy industry. Many other members of the staff served on production goal committees relative to other commodities.

Estimates were prepared for the Office of Defense Transportation and the Office of Price Administration on the quantities of petroleum handled by farmer cooperatives in 1942.

Assistance was rendered to the Department of Agriculture relative to cases involving fair application of price control programs.

Assistance was given to WPB through ascertaining the burlap requirements of rice and dry-bean cooperatives, and muslin requirements of tobacco cooperatives.

Functions of the Division aiding the war effort through assistance to the cooperatives:

Cataloged and studied each official order affecting livestock, meats and wool, and made representation to the respective war agency whenever it appeared that such order would work a hardship on cooperatives or other businesses.

Conducted a survey for the War Production Board and Office of Agricultural War Relations on all oilseed processing capacity, cooperative and otherwise, in the United States as a basis of allocation of steel in plant construction. This survey was used in the development of the whole program of plant construction to increase capacity of oilseed processing plants in 1942.

Prepared a news letter at intervals of approximately 2 weeks interpreting war orders and advising cooperatives regarding Selective Service orders, OPA regulations, and WPB orders.

Work was carried on with farmers' cooperative associations and others to assist them with wartime problems arising particularly from shortages of feed, labor, credit, and equipment—both farm and plant—in the poultry field.

Studied possibilities of greater farm production through neighborhood cooperation.

Information was developed for purchasing associations on the wartime importance of retail credit controls.

Analysis was made of the methods used by purchasing associations to meet urgent packaging problems due to shortages of burlap and other customary packaging materials.

Information was prepared and presented to cooperative managers on methods of maintaining organizational efficiency in wartime.

Material was prepared and distributed to the United States purchasing cooperatives on the experiences of British purchasing cooperatives which had been operating for several years under war conditions.

Assistance was given to cooperatives manufacturing feed in acquiring feed manufacturing facilities to help meet the critical feed shortage conditions.

Assistance was given to several large-scale cooperative purchasing associations in formulating postwar readjustment plans.

At the request of a number of State colleges of agriculture, advisory guidance was rendered to numerous dairy cooperatives through which savings were realized in both materials and manpower.

Assistance was rendered to tobacco cooperatives in connection with their problems arising from OPA regulations.

Helped to keep officials of banks for cooperatives informed regarding new regulations and orders issued from time to time. Also upon request, checked up on priority applications filed by cooperatives on projects being financed by the banks for cooperatives.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Senate will restore these funds and that the House conferees will accept the recommendations of the Senate.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the cooperatives of this country deeply appreciate the fact that they have as able a spokesman as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I concur in the statements he has made. The Cooperative Marketing

Act of 1926 provided that that research and service facilities should be provided for farmers' cooperative associations. As a result the Cooperative Research and Service Division was formed and is now an operating division of the Farm Credit Administration. During the 1951 fiscal year $585,000 was appropriated for this Division. The Bureau of the Budget estimated that $580,000 would be required for this program during fiscal 1952 and although the committee report suggests that research funds for the Department of Agriculture "should be reduced by approximately 10 percent," only $300,000 has been allotted to this program or a reduction of approximately 48 percent. It would seem that this is out of proportion to the reduction made in the funds for other agencies and would definitely have a crippling effect on a program that means so much to farmer cooperatives.

It has been suggested that the cost of this research should be paid by benefited cooperatives. While there may be merit to this proposal it would be difficult to assess the costs of the research that benefits a large group of cooperatives in varying degrees. If a business organization pays the entire cost of a research program it regards the results as its own property and is not required to make the results available to the general public as a Government agency is required to do. Traditionally research and education have been Government functions in America. This is particularly true when it affects groups of people who are not in a position to conduct their own research work. Most farmers and farmers' cooperatives are not in a position to do this work. Farmers looks to their cooperatives for help in solving their marketing problems and this Division has done good work in studying the problem and passing on the results of their research to all farmer cooperatives.

Studies made by this division on agriculture cooperatives are similar to the studies made by the Department of Commerce for business and industry and which are carried on with funds appropriated by the Congress. If one group should have the benefit of Government help for these studies, who is to say that they should be denied to another segment of our economy. If it is the will of the Congress, that Government research service should be paid by the groups benefited it would require special legislation under which such funds could be collected. It would take time to work out a program to continue the work of the agency under such a plan and in the meantime the staff would be scattered and trained personnel now available would look elsewhere for work since there are no other funds provided to carry on this work except by this appropriation.

During normal years the studies made by the Cooperative Research and Service Division are primarily for cooperatives to improve their operations and management. During World War II, studies were carried on that were valuable to all industry and to the defense agencies. Much the same program can again be carried on during this emergency. As in World War II, this Division can again help mobilize the cooperatives so that there will be full cooperation by this organized group. We feel that this agency should expect to have its appropriation reduced on the same basis as the other research agencies of the Department, however, the proposed cut of 48 percent is too drastic. This cut would be in opposition to the record of Congress that has been favorable to the program of helping farmers help themselves. Since most farmer cooperatives are made up of the family type farmer, which the Congress has time and again indicated it desired to help, this reduction is of particular harm to that group.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of Department of Agriculture, $2,157,200, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 44, line 14, strike out "$2,157,200" and insert "$2,082,200."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes, so that I can go into this subject thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will take only 3 percent out of the item affecting directly the immediate office of the Secretary.

I think it would be only good business to show to the gentlemen at the top of this vast organization of the Department of Agriculture, with more than 60,000 employees, that they themselves in that immediate office must try to do a little economizing. I can show the House, and I intend to do so, just where $75,000 can easily be taken out of this item without harm in any way.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is not this one of the offices that are padded with an enormous number of high-priced folks?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is what I want to bring out.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Office of the Secretary could well operate on a maximum of $2,082,200 for the next fiscal year. Consequently, I am offering an amendment to reduce the figure in the bill from $2,157,200 by $75,000. I would like to point out several places where there seems to be an excess of high-priced personnel. Please keep in mind that the Secretary does also have access to the services of personnel in the numerous bureaus under his jurisdiction. I would also like to call your attention to a breakdown which I have analyzed for the 1952 request of the immediate office of the Secretary. We note here that the Secretary of Agriculture as a Cabinet officer receives a salary of $22,500. He has an Under Secretary who is paid $17,500. There is one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture who is paid $15,000 per year. An executive assistant to the Secretary receives $11,400. No one can really find much fault with the four top positions in the Secretary's immediate office but as we go down the list we find that there are six additional assistants to the Secretary, each of whom average $10,475 per year. We also find an Administrator of the land and water resources program who is paid $11,000. There is an agricultural economist receiving $11,400. As we scrutinize a little further 11 other positions known as administrative officers, each of whom receive about $8,800 per year are listed and to complete the bill there are six so-called agriculturists who are paid better than $9,000 each. In addition to these 24 top jobs in the Secretary's immediate office we have 48 minor positions from $3,900 up. The total amount requested for the Secretary's immediate office is $520,000.

Let us scan another Division—Personnel Administration and Service. Here the top positions are not nearly as numerous, but we do have 100 positions in that Division of the Secretary's office ranging from $11,400 for the Director of Personnel down to the compensation for clerical workers. It is interesting to note here that there are two assistant directors of personnel at $10,000 each. We have 7 chiefs of divisions in this part of the Secretary's office who are paid $9,400 each—2 assistant chiefs receiving $8,400 each—11 chiefs of sections drawing from $7,600 to $8,600. I will not enumerate the others, but will now turn to the Budget office, which is also a small division of the Secretary's office. We find

the Director of Finance and Budget receiving $11,400—and I will say, at this point, that I think that the present occupant of this position is well worth that salary. But I would suggest that perhaps he has at least one too many assistant directors of finance. I note he has four such assistant directors listed here at $9,400 each. Here, again, we find seven chiefs of divisions each being paid in the neighborhood of $8,400. We also find eight chiefs of sections receiving in the neighborhood of $6,800 each. That particular Division of the Secretary's office has 126 positions, and 16 of those positions pay $8,000 or over each.

We will now turn to the division in the Secretary's office known as General Operations, where there are 102 positions. The Director of Plant and Operations receives $10,750. He has three assistant directors under him receiving on an average $8,750. We find the usual number of chiefs of divisions, but one thing in particular stands out which I think could be studied carefully—the Real Estate Division in this particular part of the Secretary's office has a chief—an administrative officer, two administrative assistants and four architectural engineers—the latter receiving on an average about $6,100 per annum. Just why it should be necessary to hire that number of architectural engineers, I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, this outline will give some idea as to the number of high-paid positions in the Secretary's office—and I say high paid when I think of the fact that very few people in my district in southwestern Minnesota earn up to $10,000 a year in business or in the professions. Frankly, I question the advisability of the Secretary having, in addition to the three major positions directly under him, six assistants to the Secretary. You would think that one assistant to each of the top four officials would be sufficient. I also question the presence of four agriculturists in the Land and Water Resources Division. Certainly it seems that we should not have to spend $124,700 in that particular little division in the Secretary's immediate office when we have the elaborate set-ups that are in some of the major divisions of the Department, such as Soil Conservation Service, which could well handle, it would seem to me, the bulk of that work. I question the need for the numerous chiefs of divisions and chiefs of sections. It makes me wonder just who really does do the work. It would seem that perhaps there should be a division in the Secretary's office devoted to examining ways and means of eliminating useless positions in the entire Department of Agriculture and also within his immediate office.

If we remember that this reduction amounts to only 3 percent and that all of this personnel listed in these sheets I have in my hand represent less than 1 percent of the administrative personnel in the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true also that the Secretary, if he has an emergency or great pressure in his office, can move people in there, and does he not now have the right under the law to do that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Secretary has the right under the law, if I am correct, to transfer funds to the extent of 7 percent from any part of the huge Department of Agriculture to another part where they may be slightly squeezed financially. He needs that elastic provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] on the section dealing with the Farm Credit Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of the House, one of the most difficult things to defend has always been the office personnel in the city of Washington. It is always popular to cut those things that are a long way from home. I know the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is motivated by the finest of intentions. But I do want to give you my opinion and my views with regard to the Secretary's office.

The Secretary's office is operating, if this bill is passed, programs totalling approximately $720,000,000 in direct annual appropriations. In addition, in the Department of Agriculture we have the Farmers Home Administration, the International Wheat Agreement operation, the foot-and-mouth disease operation, and the rural electrification operation, which require well over a quarter of a billion dollars a year, that are operated through the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Since I have been chairman of this committee I have from time to time had serious questions raised as to the operations of various segments of the Department, and each time that has occurred I have had an investigation made, and each time I have had an investigation made I have found many things that needed to be corrected . To whom do we have to look to bring about those corrections and to see that there is proper coordination and improvement in the situation that we have found to exist? We have to look to the offices in the District of Columbia, and particularly the Secretary.

This is no plea for Charles Brannan, as such. I made the closing argument against the Brannan plan when it was before the Congress a year or two ago. I pointed out when they wanted a trial run of the Brannan plan that we had our trial run during the war, and it did not work. But if you are going to have this big operation, it is bad judgment and poor policy not to operate it from the top.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Of course the gentleman knows that all of the big number of bureaus in the Department have top men by the score, from whom Mr. Brannan can secure almost unlimited assistance if he sees fit.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is no attack on the gentleman from Minnesota. I have said that he might be right and I might be wrong, but I want to show the other side of it.

You do not have a single Department of Agriculture. You have a series of bureaus and agencies. You have the Rural Electrification Administration, you have the Bureau of Animal Industry, you have the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and you have the Bureau of Industrial Chemistry, each of them practically independent, and to some extent many of them duplicating each other, as our reports show.

We have the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. I had an investigation made there a year or two ago, and it disclosed that they had a huge amount of surplus products. Through the Secretary's office I was able to see to it that they sold around $4,000,000 worth of that property, and the money went into the Treasury. That is over and above the amount of property that was turned over to other agencies.

On top of this group of offices and agencies you have the Secretary's office. His office consists of four principal parts: his immediate office, the Office of Personnel, the Office of Budget and Finance, and the Office of Hearing Examiners which has to do with all these milk pricing orders, a very big operation.

You will recall the instance last year when the Secretary asked for three or four Assistant Secretaries. At the time I opposed it, but the record showed that he had about one-sixth as many as the Department of the Interior. Your committee has held this group down. I would like to point out something else.

In connection with the war effort we have called on the various departments to do their best for the war effort. Allotments were contemplated to be made from the national defense set-up to the various departments. I was author of a provision in the third deficiency bill which requires the Department to go ahead and do the war work and to curtail their domestic program to the extent necessary. That task is being assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture. Today we have got to look to the Secretary's office to represent us in matters having to do with beef prices, and all that kind of thing. The Office of the Secretary is the office to which we must look to protect the cause of agriculture and the individual worker in agriculture. His office has a great deal to do with the effort to get sufficient allocations of steel for farm machinery and chemicals for fertilizer. We have got to look to the Secretary's office for all those things. It is not going to be an easy job to do these things. Why, for $75,000, give them an excuse for not doing these things?

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. There may be an explanation for this in the Office of the Secretary, but I notice an item for advertising. Is that to advertise the operations of the Department, or what does it entail? And how much money, if it does include that, how much of the amount intended here to be spent is spent by the Secretary for advertising what he is doing in the Department?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no money in this bill for advertising as such.

Mr. KEATING. But the bill itself uses the word "advertising."

Mr. WHITTEN. Why do all this research work, find solutions to all these problems, and not let the people know what has been done, what can be done, and how they are made available? If there has been some misuse of funds in regard to these operations, I assure the gentleman that I will be the first to try to strike at such abuses.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the gentleman will, but I am wondering what this particular word "advertising" means in this one item. This is money to be spent and I wonder what that advertising by the Secretary of Agriculture amounted to.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I understand, that is to be used by the Secretary's office in advertising for bids for the purchase of equipment and supplies.

Mr. KEATING. If that is the purpose of the item I would, of course, have no objection. That is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. WHITTEN. For the moment it had escaped me, but as the gentleman from Rhode Island says, it is to be used for advertising for bids.

Mr. KEATING. That kind of advertising is all right. What I object to is the propaganda items for which money is spent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me proceed with my statement.

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

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

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that there are over 40 drawing $9,000 a year and nearly 30 drawing over $10,000 a year in this set-up?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the Congress, has through the Civil Service and the Classification Act, set up the classification of employees. Since I have been a Member, the Congress has raised the salaries. I will hold Charlie Brannan responsible for a lot of things but I will not hold him responsible for the acts of Congress. When it comes to handling the operation of a billion and a half dollars a year, when we give to him the task of seeing that farmers get adequate farm machinery, equipment, fertilizer, and so forth, when we require them to absorb national defense work, I personally do not want to give him something to hide behind by cutting out about $75,000. Since 1940, we have reduced the number of employees by about 240 and we have continuously reduced them. Last year we reduced the number 24. This year we are about $31,000 under the budget.

I certainly believe you will make a mistake if you cut further here, because it is to this office we must look for correction of the things that we find going wrong in the field. That would be true of any other department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 63, noes 50.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: Page 44, line 10, after the word "advertising", insert "of bids."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken: and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALE) there were—ayes 66, noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $600,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I expect that I am in the position of the man who said that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I appreciate the fine work that has been done by the subcommittee, and I do not pose as an expert on appropriations. I am concerned, however, about this item of $600,000 for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. I notice that it provides for $600,000, but in looking over the testimony it seems to me this office has had considerably more than that. May I ask the gentleman from Washington, who I believe has handled this item, just how much was contributed by the ECA and the point 4 agency and the Defense Production Agency?

Mr. HORAN. To my knowledge, there is none from ECA or point 4. There is an item of transfer from Research and Marketing Act funds, which takes care of the foreign agricultural specialists.

As far as my being the expert on this subcommittee on this item, I would not say that. I am very much interested in the item, and propose to take a little of the committee's time after the gentleman has concluded to explain what troubles some of us regarding it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I notice that in the testimony on page 254 Mr. ANDREWS mentioned the sum of $2,000,000 being transferred to this agency. I am sure there is considerable duplication in this matter. The State Department is doing the same kind of work. There is obviously here some conflict between State and Agriculture Departments as to who should do the work, but I have a suspicion that both of them want to do the work, to the end that there is going to be considerable duplication and the spending of more money than is needed for the purpose.

Mr. HORAN. May I say that I am glad that the gentleman from Wisconsin has brought up this subject because it does need clarification. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, though, because if I were to explain how I feel about it I would consume all of his time. I will take my own time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I appreciate that very much.

May I say that I have observed this program on the part of agriculture as it is operating in South America, and I have a great deal of praise for the effort that is being made, but somewhere pretty soon between State and Agriculture they ought to work out this matter so that there will be no duplication of effort. I think that as the matter stands now this amount could be cut in half. I would not want to leave the impression that I am here arguing the point for the State Department, because I have the feeling that the Department of Agriculture can do a much better job in this field.

I was quite interested, Mr. Chairman, in the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on page 238 in a letter that was quoted:

> The prospects for more adequate appropriations for agriculture work within the unified Foreign Service, we believe, could be significantly improved if our two departments agreed on a program of administrative improvement that would commend itself to Congress and to organized agriculture.

It seems to me he is suggesting that both departments get together and perhaps, as one member has said, kiss and make up, and maybe between the two of them they can get a lot more money.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Are we furnishing aid in agriculture in the way of expert advice to the foreign countries, in Europe, for instance?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed.

Mr. REED of New York. I was in Ireland in 1949 and visited the agriculture college at Dublin. They have their farm agents, and they have a wonderful course in agriculture there. You see improvements all over Ireland. I do not see why we have to be contributing to that service over there. They seem to be doing very well. In the other countries I have been in they certainly were doing excellent work. It is not necessary to have our experts there in order for them to do it. They are old civilizations. Their land has stood up, and is

productive now after more than 1,000 years of cultivation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think the remarks of the gentleman from New York are well taken. I hope this subcommittee is going to give some attention to this matter of the overlapping of functions between Agriculture and State Departments and that when this appropriation comes up again next year it will be clarified.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an item which has troubled more than the gentleman from Wisconsin and has troubled me as well as this subcommittee and the entire House Committee on Agriculture. I ask your indulgence that I may review the work in the Department of Agriculture ever since 1862 when the Department was organized on foreign agricultural relations. At that time we saw fit to have men in the Department of Agriculture who could investigate or assay the market for agricultural products abroad and the production in other countries. Gradually through the years this function in the Department of Agriculture became useful. In 1930 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations was formally organized, and that is the appropriation, for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, about which we are now talking.

The gimmick in this thing came with the Reorganization Act of 1939. In that act we made agricultural attachés and commercial attachés agents of the State Department. I know in the popular mind one would think that a foreign agricultural attaché reports back to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. He does not. He reports back to Secretary of State Acheson. I maintain that that is wrong. Certainly commercial attachés should report back to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer and not to Secretary Sawyer through the Secretary of State—no matter who the Secretary of State might be.

I maintain and from my own personal investigations and observations, I can say that we do not have effective representation for American farmers in foreign countries today. The only office we have in the United States today that really speaks for and looks out for the interest of the American farmer is the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations for which we have fully provided, according to the budget, in this bill, and the foreign agricultural commodity specialists who are paid for by a transfer of some $140,000 from the Research and Marketing Act funds.

You asked me about point 4 and the ECA. There is work being done there. The money has been expended on that. That is a separate consideration. That is expected to be terminated. But we do not want the only ones who represent and fight for American farmers in foreign countries to be abused by striking out this item from the bill. You asked me why these men did not kiss and make up. Heaven only knows the efforts that have been going on ever since we saw the mistakes that were made in the Reorganization Act of 1939 and the efforts that have been going on through the years. The House Committee on Agriculture has been working at it. We are making headway because we are defending those in government who are doing something for the good of our American farmers.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate the remarks the gentleman is making. Is it not a fact, too, that this appraisal and testimony not only of foreign production of agricultural commodities, but the possibilities of export of American agricultural commodities to foreign countries is an extremely important part of the work done by this office?

Mr. HORAN. Very definitely.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman should not give the impression that perhaps kissing and making up is the solution. What we want is a direct relationship between the Department of Agriculture and our foreign embassies and consulates. If the gentleman has the time, I would like to ask him to explain to the committee the delays which have been caused by this roundabout proceeding.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to finish what I started to say, and if it takes more time than I have, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask for the additional brief time that it will take to explain that.

Here is the difficulty. When our agricultural and other commercial attachés became members of the State Department in many instances their salaries were greater and their retirement pay was greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, in many ways they were paid better than the men who served in the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations when they became members of the State Department. Men who had been Agriculture Department attachés have become counselors and ministers, and I believe in one instance an agricultural attaché is an ambassador. Do you not see the mistakes we made? The only way to correct it is to do what this subcommittee has been doing for many years, to defend and point up the work that is being done by this particular office in the Department of Agriculture, and to insist that, at the Cabinet level, corrections be made.

I think we are going to have to recommend a modification of the Reorganization Act of 1939 so as to make our agricultural attachés and commercial attachés report back direct to their respective Secretaries, the same as our military attachés do today. Until that time comes we have really got to correct this thing. Let us protect, in the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the group of men who are carrying on as best they can in a very troubled world, the things that need to be done to protect the farmers of America.

There is another point that should be raised. When we have an agricultural attaché he is a member of the State Department, and when we have a reciprocal trade team going to a given point, there to negotiate in a trade on tariffs that might interest us, the captain of that team is always a man high up in the Department of State. It is true that agricultural specialists and attachés do attend those hearings, but where there are two strikes on the batter and there is only one ball left to swing at, it is the man from the State Department who takes the stand and swings that bat for the third time. In other words, by our own actions we have allowed the Department of State to dominate two departments in America that are very important to the farmers of America and American businessmen. I contend that is not what we had in mind when we set up the American Cabinet system.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is saying that the office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is in a position to supply us with the best information we can get in these foreign countries.

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I would like to supplement his statement by saying that Mr. Stanley Andrews has given our committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, invaluable information on the situation in Asia.

Mr. HORAN. I understand that. We on the Committee on Agriculture have great respect for Mr. Andrews, and I understand he also is from Arkansas. I hope your committee will look into this thing in the name of equity and justice, and see if there are some modifications that should be made.

Before I close I want to pay my compliments to the House Committee on Agriculture for the report on this whole matter which they put out on March 22, which I think pretty well lays the facts before you and tells you some part of the problems and what ought to be done.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Who hired these men who are serving in these foreign countries?

Mr. HORAN. Some of them came out of the Department of Agriculture in the case of attachés, although I know of one instance where an attaché is in one of the embassies over the protest of the Secretary of Agriculture. You can see that is not good.

Mr. FOGARTY. And you cannot do anything about that?

Mr. HORAN. Not a thing. We cannot do anything about it. They are in the State Department; not in the Department of Agriculture. The office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is the only body we have speaking for the American farmer in foreign lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to pay a brief tribute to the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, a very intelligent, sincere, and dynamic administrator, Hon. Stanley Andrews. I know that he is doing an excellent job and is performing in fine fashion the duties of his high position. Stanley Andrews is outspoken, frank, and forthright, and I have great confidence in his ability and great faith in his efforts. Until Stanley Andrews became Director of this very important agency of our Government, it was, to use a common expression, "dragging its feet," when all of the officers and employees of the agency should have been alert and wide awake to the great importance of their assignments. In my opinion this agency of the Government was woefully weak and badly handicapped.

Appreciating the importance of intelligent and effective representation in the fields of agriculture in foreign countries and realizing the weaknesses and inadequacies of this agency of Government, the House Committee on Agriculture conducted a study of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and in the course of this study members of our committee visited many foreign countries and conferred with many of our agricultural attachés and commodity specialists. We also conferred with those representing agriculture in our ECA missions abroad and likewise with the ministers of agriculture in many of the countries of the world. Our committee now has an abundance of information concerning the situations existing in different parts of the world, and we know something about the importance of the agency of the Government which we are now discussing. After conferring with Mr. Andrews and with his associates and after making the studies I have referred to, many substantial changes have been made and we earnestly believe that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is now functioning effectively and will continue to improve as Congress provides the necessary money and manpower for the needed expansion of the activities of this agency.

Instead of merely collecting statistics, many of which are of doubtful value, the employees of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations should really and truly represent American agriculture abroad and should make real contributions to the cause of agriculture around the world and, above all, should be directly responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture who, in turn, is directly responsible to Congress. All of our representatives in foreign countries should be impressed with the importance of export markets for the things produced on the American farm. Actually, many of our ambassadors are so carried away with their striped breeches and top hats and with protocol and social events they have little or no time to devote to the problems of agriculture. And many of them frankly are just not interested in anything pertaining to agriculture. Some of them are not even able to discuss the problems of agriculture with any degree of intelligence and display an utter indifference to the problems of the American farmer. Yet, even in the present situation those who are charged with the responsibility of activities pertaining to agriculture are required to report through all of this diplomatic red tape to the State Department rather than to the Department of Agriculture. While the Secretary of Agriculture selects and nominates the persons to be employed by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in foreign assignments, all such employees are attached to the State Department payroll and they become swallowed up in diplomatic red tape and some of them actually forget that after all they are just farm boys employed to do a job in a foreign country. The agricultural attachés and commodity specialists are subordinated and submerged in just about every way possible. Many of them never have a chance to discuss their problems and their responsibilities with ambassadors and ministers of agriculture in the countries to which they have been assigned.

Following our study of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and since Stanley Andrews has taken over as Director, some men have been retired and some have been hired, and all of the employees have been aroused and advised of the importance of their duties. If some of our ambassadors don't wake up to the importance of American agriculture and to the importance of export markets for the products of our farms, and if they do not show some interest in the problems of world agriculture and of the world food supply, some of them ought to be retired or fired. I do not mean to indict our entire diplomatic corps by any means. Some of our ambassadors are intensely interested in the problems of agriculture and understand the importance of American agriculture in world trade and commerce.

Just to give you an idea about how some of our agricultural men abroad are handicapped and hamstrung, I would like to call your attention to a situation which I ran across last fall. I was in the beautiful city of Lisbon and spent many hours with one of our agricultural representatives, making on-the-spot observations on some of the farms of Portugal. This representative was a man of wide experience and great competency. He had only been in Portugal for a short time, but I am convinced that he knew more about Portuguese agriculture than all the ministers of agriculture who had served Portugal in the past quarter of a century. Yet he told me that notwithstanding all that he had learned about Portuguese agriculture and the urgent problems facing the farmers of that country, he could not arrange an audience with those to whom he should tell his story. Of course an agricultural attaché or a commodity specialist cannot dash in to see a foreign minister of agriculture, nor can he at will confer with the Ambassador, but certainly someone, somehow, should be able to arrange such meetings.

I talked with another agricultural attaché who told me that although he had spent 2 or 3 years attached to a certain embassy, he was convinced that the ambassador did not even know who he was and had no idea as to his responsibilities. This man was also one of our very best agricultural representatives, and yet he, too, was hamstrung and submerged in the diplomatic whirlpool.

Our agricultural men abroad have not been accorded the same opportunities for promotion, nor have they been given the same recognition that is accorded the other employees of the State Department; so as a result of this unfortunate situation, a lot of these well-meaning and well-trained agricultural college graduates look for greener pastures and for more lucrative and more attractive assignments. They visualize themselves dressed in striped pants and Homburgs and as consuls or ministers or even perhaps ambassadors; so many of them find other positions.

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations should be well financed and well staffed, with competent agricultural specialists, and they should be accorded all the privileges and opportunities which are accorded commercial attachés, political attachés, and other employees of the State Department.

We have been assured that efforts are now being made to improve the situation, which unfortunately has existed. I certainly hope that by appropriate administrative orders and rules and regulations the situation will be improved, and I earnestly hope that no effort will be made to reduce this appropriation for the OFAR, which I honestly consider to be very modest and a very minimum upon which the agency should be required to operate.

Through the OFAR we should be able to obtain very important information and through this agency we should be able to keep in touch with situations abroad. Great demands are being made upon our resources. Many gifts and grants to foreign countries are being authorized by Congress, and through the OFAR the Committees of Congress should be able to obtain accurate information as to the needs of those countries which petition us for either gifts, grants, or loans.

Likewise, the OFAR should be able to furnish us with pertinent information concerning our export markets for agricultural commodities, and each of the employees of this office in foreign assignments should, above all, be ambassadors of friendship in the countries where they are serving.

I observe that there has been a revival of interest in the activities of the OFAR, and I indulge the hope that this agency will become a vital force in foreign affairs and will function effectively in the welfare of our people.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work and programs

authorized by Congress in the Department, $1,271,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than 230,850 copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided*, That additional funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in lines 4 to 9, inclusive, page 46, on the ground that it involves additional duties on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 46, line 4, in lieu of the matter stricken insert "together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the language as now offered by the gentleman from Mississippi strikes out the words "as may be determined by the Secretary." The action of transferring these additional appropriations from another fund still requires, whether those words are there or not, independent action on the part of the Secretary, therefore, it does involve additional duties on his part and is still subject to the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this language has been held to be in order many times. Under the general transfer provisions of the bill the Department of Agriculture may transfer to the extent of 7 percent. This is a limitation on the amount he may transfer, because in the absence of this limitation the 7-percent provision would apply.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that frequently we see this language in an appropriation bill. But no point of order is made against it. When a point of order is made against such language, I believe it should be stricken because it does involve additional duties on the part of the Secretary; otherwise, there is no method of knowing how much of this amount will be transferred. It does not authorize the appropriation or transfer of a specific sum of money.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a new appropriation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is not new at all. Without this language they could transfer a certain amount of money. With this language there is an intimation given as to how much money may be transferred. The Department has a general provision making it possible to transfer up to 7 percent. So there being no new money here and this being a limitation or reducing the amount below that which could otherwise be transferred, I respectfully insist it is not subject to a point of order. I might also point out that this is expressly authorized under 601 of the Economy Act, 31 United States Code, 686.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair feels this is a transfer within the Department of Agriculture authorized by law. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in discussing the point of order, this is a limitation on the amount of transfer insofar as the intent of the committee is concerned. While this sounds like an authorization for transferring money, to those who do not like any transfer at all it is better to have some limitation instead of none.

I respectfully submit that the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641–1642).

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on page 50, lines 5 to 12, inclusive, International Wheat Agreement, on the ground that that is a new authorization and a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to handle this item contrary to the manner in which it has been handled, and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4).

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 51, line 21, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve, to be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary due to the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic commodities requiring mandatory price controls."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand the gentleman from Mississippi is in agreement with this amendment.

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say that this appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation in effect is a limitation on the administrative funds that can be used. I am well aware of the efforts on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] to try to hold down these administrative costs, and I concur in those efforts. However, realizing the great demands being made on American agriculture to produce, and knowing that the only thing that stands between them and absolute ruin under some conditions is the Commodity Credit Corporation, that we have a hesitancy to hold the limitation as low as we might otherwise. It strikes me that the approach the gentleman makes is utterly sound, and we join with him. I just want to say that we are all driving in the same direction, that the approach is sound, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the action taken by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], as well as that of the entire subcommittee. I am certain that this is a move in the right direction.

So that the background of the amendment may be fully explained and available to the Commodity Credit Corporation, I want to outline briefly the facts which led me to submit it. It would set aside $1,000,000 from the $15,000,000 recommended by the subcommittee for administrative expenses in a reserve fund and no expenditures could be made from that $1,000,000 unless and until the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic commodities developed to justify any use of any part of this $1,000,000.

The budget estimate was for $20,200,000.

Any study of the hearings presents convincing evidence of the wisdom of the subcommittee's decision to recommend a reduction of $5,200,000. It may be thought that this reduction is substantial. Of course, it is, but there is clear and sufficient evidence to convince anyone that we are amply warranted in making this further restriction.

It is clear from the hearings that no satisfactory effort was made by this Agency to relate its requests for funds to its requirements or to existing conditions. It just used the same figure it used when it submitted its supplemental request to Congress on November 29, 1950, of $3,850,000, bringing the total request in fiscal 1951 to $20,200,000. The subcommittee was amply warranted in reporting that "this"—its—"reduction is believed justified in view of the current outlook for agriculture and the probable change from surpluses to shortages in many of the commodities normally handled by the Corporation."

It is equally clear that the request submitted last fall and presented to the subcommittee on February 12 has no relation to the Agency's activities now, or in prospect for fiscal 1952.

Its latest report is for the month ending March 31. I placed in the RECORD last Wednesday the results of a study of its commodity inventories on March 31 compared to June 30, 1950.

In butter, cheese, dried milk, and dried eggs alone there was a reduction of 505,699,732 pounds, from 677,401,610 pounds to 171,701,878 pounds.

Extending this to 16 commodities, the reduction is from 6,561,211,062 pounds to 2,604,691,295 pounds, or a decrease of 60.3 percent.

The same sharp downward trend in holdings is evident in most of the other commodities. Let me give you seven examples:

		June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
Cotton	bales	3,413,635	86,813
Cottonseed	tons	211,178	2,941
Flaxseed	bushels	13,373,583	5,117,761
Turpentine	gallons	2,586,765	500,000
Oats	bushels	12,108,620	9,997,233
Rye	do	514,624	364,274
Soybeans	do	53,017	1,093

An examination of the estimate shows that about 75 percent is for personal services, $15,042,000 of the $20,200,000.

It is significant that this Agency's estimate shows a request for 814 more employees than in fiscal 1951, from 3,721 to 4,535.

It is of greater significance that its representative offered as one justification for its request that 2 or 3 weeks before its last appearance before the subcommittee on February 20, it had asked to be declared, and had been declared, a Defense Agency. This resulted in a very proper and pertinent examination by the subcommittee. Let me quote:

Mr. HORAN. Do not forget this: That a man who is in a defense agency, whether he is doing good work or not—and we all have to admit the possibility that he might be loafing—under certain circumstances, especially unless you and this committee can justify his existence as a Government employee, as a member working for a defense agency, he has at least one additional bargaining argument with the draft board whereas some of our 18-year-olds out on the farms who are actually producing wnat the PMA is interested in may not have an equal argument with the draft board in his county. That can happen. That can happen unless we take a very realistic look at this defense agency picture.

The subcommittee requested a statement of estimated price-support volume for fiscal 1952. There is a notation that it was an estimate as of February 1.

A study of that against the March 31 report points up conclusively the unrealistic approach taken by this Agency toward its requirements.

Let me take just three commodities:

	Estimated inventory	Actual inventory
	Pounds	*Pounds*
Butter	26,649,213	9,955,226
Cheese	10,902,053	7,145
Dried milk	222,931,819	94,170,819
Total	260,483,085	104,133,190

That is 156,349,895 pounds below the estimates for fiscal 1952, more than a 60-percent difference. I have tried to obtain more current information but have found no one who will give me facts as to the inventory situation today. But there is an item on the ticker in the Speaker's lobby stating that the Department of Agriculture has announced it is buying no more butter.

There is a very important statement by Mr. Trigg at page 119 of the hearings. After stating that they had $1,618,000,000 worth of commodities in inventory then, the chairman of the subcommittee said, "You have that now, but what is it going to be by the 1st of July?" Mr. Trigg replied, "We will have some new crops at that time; our budget estimate is that we will have inventories valued at $1,900,000,000 on July 1, 1951."

Standing alone this means nothing. Here is the CCC report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. On July 1, 1950, they had on hand inventories valued at $2,643,153,372.70. So their own budget estimate anticipates about $750,000,000 less to begin this coming fiscal year. And I submit I have proven how much in error their fall and winter estimates were.

Beyond this, does anybody think that this agency is going to embark on a program of buying up huge quantities of wholesome foods in the foreseeable future, with prospective shortages and skyrocketing prices. If there is any danger of this, it is one more good reason for making certain that it can do no such thing by not authorizing too much money.

The hearings also include a table—table 6 at page 68 of the hearings—showing the corporate administration expense limitations from 1938 to 1950, inclusive, in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Production Credit Corporation and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation started at $500,000 in 1938 and progressively increased each year, with two exceptions, until it reached $20,200,000 in this fiscal year. That is 394 percent increase. The other four have either progressively decreased or have increased only moderately.

I have prepared the following table from the summary and from recent reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is in millions of dollars:

1938	0.5
1939	.7
1940	2.0
1941	2.3
1942	3.5
1943	4.4
1944	5.4
1945	7.2
1946	8.9
1947	8.8
1949	8.1
1950	15.4
1951	20.2
Estimated, 1952	20.2

The subcommittee provided probably the most convincing argument for a further reduction in its report filed on April 4, 1949, and I want to quote the pertinent language:

The budget estimate for this purpose is in the sum of $12,000,000 which the committee has approved. The amount provided in the regular act for 1949 was $7,575,000. In the first deficiency bill now pending in the Senate, this 1949 amount is increased to $10,814,700. The necessity for

this increase is occasioned by the excessively large 1948 crop resulting in a drop in prices of a number of the major commodities below the level established by law, requiring substantial increases in the number of loans and other price support activities. The increase provided in the deficiency bill referred to will cover the increased activities of the corporation in this field for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Here, then, we have a clear contrast in the very substantially increased activities justifying an appropriation in the sum of $12,000,000 for fiscal 1950 in comparison to the admitted sharp decrease in activities now and in prospect for fiscal 1952.

I also placed in the Appendix of the RECORD on May 10 at page A2691 excerpts from questions and statements of members of the committee, particularly those of the able chairman of this subcommittee. I want to repeat a few of these:

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us just get down to brass tacks. I think you will admit, under the present outlook, that you will not have one-half the volume of commodities for the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you have had this year, will you not? (p. 118).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. But, as I was pointing out, you will not be handling as big a volume of commodities for one thing.

Mr. TRIGG. Of course, we will not. * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. We should set these figures of administrative expense knowing today that there is every probability that you will handle less volume. If the situation gets out of hand later, you could then come back and ask for more employees for the CCC (p. 119).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Again, I am not suggesting a major reduction in expenses. I am just discussing the difference between $17,000,000 and $20,000,000 or $15,000,000 for that purpose. I think your figures can stand a lot of study for the next fiscal year (p. 119).

Mr. HORAN. I just want to point out that we have revised our thinking, too, up here in Congress, and the Korean war and the defense effort has caused that. The average cost has gone up, and I think that you as taxpayers are looking to us to do what we can to hold down costs wherever we can, to see that any of these items are justified in reality, and I am disturbed about the size and the shape of this particular item. I do not want to do anything to hurt the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize what it means, but along with the chairman and the rest of this subcommittee, we need your cooperation on this. We want to do what we are supposed to do, but frankly I am still at a loss as to why this item should be increased (p. 132).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. HORAN, I think you have proven our case. The testimony up to this point is that last May and June the Commodity Credit Corporation made a survey and arrived at how much manpower it would take to handle a given volume on a per unit basis. Then they multiplied that by the volume, and they came up with this $20,200,000, which includes the $3,850,000 they are asking for now. They cannot sustain that, because they will not have that volume.

Mr. BEACH. It appears that way.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just said it was that. You said last May and June you worked up the unit cost, coming up with $20,000,000. Now you come up with the same number of dollars, so you are bound to have used the same volume. You may have some difference from one program to another, but you are using approximately the same volume in total. You cannot justify it (pp. 132–133).

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities—you cannot have anything like the volume of work through the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you had this year (p. 534).

Finally, I recognize that it could be argued that this is only a limitation and that the Agency must be expected to hold down its expenditures as far as possible. If it was a question of an operation which was either breaking even or making a profit, that might be a legitimate argument. However, from its own report, from October 17, 1933, through March 31, 1951, it shows a total loss of $2,671,384,309.

It pays the costs of administrative expenses from its capital funds, but in the final analysis that money is raised from only one source—taxation. I am certain that we are on sound ground in taking this action this afternoon. An unrestricted authorization to use the full $15,000,000 would be definitely an invitation to excessive and unnecessary expenditures. This action constitutes a clear mandate and warning that every effort should be made to manage this Corporation in the light of existing conditions and with some real consideration of the burden which is going to be placed upon the American people in terms of additional taxation.

I have every confidence that this subcommittee will examine with great care any use of this $1,000,000. I hope and believe that it will not be necessary to use any part of it. This action should bring about a definite saving to the American taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 404. No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 55, line 2, strike out the word "cotton" and insert "any farm commodity."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I will not seek recognition if the committee feels inclined to accept the amendment. I have discussed it with some members of the committee who think it is wise to extend this prohibition to any farm commodity.

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say that it is entirely possible that the gentleman is correct, but this whole issue has been batted around whether it is wise or unwise in regard to cotton. I certainly would not want to agree that it applied to others for I cannot speak for so many other commodities. It is a controversial question, and I certainly would not want to do it without adequate hearings.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Mississippi, that he could not accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of section 404 is very obvious, and it is a commendable purpose, to provide that none of the funds shall be used for the payment of compensation to any officer or employee of this Department who causes a leak, let us say, as to the future prices of cotton or the trend in the price of cotton. Those on the inside in the Department of Agriculture do have confidential information about various farm commodities. It is very proper that the committee should provide that no part of these funds should be used to pay an employee who did give away some of this inside information. It seems to me that applies equally to any other farm commodity, and that anyone in the Department of Agriculture who gives inside information as to any farm commodity, in order that he or his friends or others may thereby profit, should be deprived of his compensation in just the same way that applies to cotton.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see any objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. It simply says that, along with cotton, if anybody in the Department of Agriculture for purposes of his own allows things to get out which might violate the secrecy which we hold upon the release of crop reports, he then is subject to discharge, or at least no funds in this measure will be allowed for his salary. I certainly agree with the gentleman from New York that this will not in any way harm the bill.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I am somewhat concerned, since the gentleman's amendment is very far reaching. I am thinking particularly of the livestock industry, where we have a Federal Marketing Service which does predict the market conditions in the future, and which has been of very much protection to the farmers of the Midwest. Will the gentleman tell me what his amendment would do to the prediction of the market as far as livestock is concerned?

Mr. KEATING. My feeling is that that is a public service, and that nothing in this amendment would prevent the Secretary of Agriculture in an official way from doing anything he is doing today. This whole section is directed against those who act under the table or behind the curtain. I have no pride of authorship in the precise language "any farm commodity." It certainly is not my intention to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from issuing proper market reports. Nor do I believe this

amendment would have that effect. If the gentleman has any better language to effectuate the purpose and if he is in sympathy with my objective, I would be glad to have him substitute such language as he thinks would be preferable.

Mr. MARSHALL. I can say to the gentleman that I am in sympathy with what he is attempting to do, but to attempt to write legislation here on the floor of the House today that would cover all of these items, and I am thinking particularly about the livestock industry, would be beyond my scope, without going into hearings. When you say "prediction" as outlined in this paragraph, may I say that weather conditions affect markets, so the market might be dependent upon weather conditions. There are a number of conditions involved.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, within the cotton industry there has been quite a controversy as to whether or not this provision should be in the bill with regard to cotton, but it has been in there for a number of years and, they having become reconciled to it more or less, the committee has gone along with it. But we checked with the Department, and the information they gave us is that if you do this as to all commodities you do away with the crop and livestock estimates.

The section which the gentleman seeks to broaden provides:

No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer—

And that includes the Secretary of Agriculture—

or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

It is true that the futures market on cotton has been more sensitive than any other market. If you adopt this amendment you will be destroying your marketing news service and you will be fixing it where there can be no estimate with regard to wheat and with regard to the supply of hogs and with regard to what is going to move on the market and with regard to many things that make for orderly operation at this time of all times when there is a shortage of food supplies. Now that is what I am afraid of, and there is much to indicate it, and the Department says that that is true. Now, if we had hearings on this and you may say that you might come up with a different answer, but certainly the Department, having taken their position and seeing the dangers in it now, I think you would make a serious mistake to adopt this amendment without any more explanation, other than that which the gentleman from New York intimates that he just wants others to be treated as cotton is treated. I do not want any special treatment. But some folks believe it is not good in cotton and they point out it would not work at all with regard to these other commodities. This amendment is too far reaching to be adopted without knowing what we are doing. I think this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 36, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 55, line 19, strike out on pages 55 and 56 all of section 407.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out all of section 407. That section is identical with the language which heretofore appeared in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. An amendment was offered at that time and was agreed to. Section 407 would in effect establish two pay standards for identical jobs. At this time a cost-of-living allowance is paid, under authority of Congress, to Federal employees in the Territories and possessions. In Alaska that amounts to 25 percent. In Hawaii it amounts to 20 percent, and I believe, although I am not absolutely sure, that it amounts to 25 percent in Puerto Rico. If this section is adopted, a person hired in Alaska, for example, will not receive the allowance, but the person hired in the States will get 25 percent more than the Alaskan for doing the same job. That is basically wrong.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations did include this same provision in the bill. After that the committee made a more thorough study of it and we discovered what we thought was a bad mistake.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. JENSEN. So the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself, the ranking member, and in fact the entire subcommittee, were agreeable to having that section stricken out of the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is identical, word for word, with the wording in this bill which the gentleman is asking to be stricken.

Mr. BARTLETT. We are grateful to the gentleman and his colleagues for doing that.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If my memory serves me correctly, the cost of living in Alaska is considerably higher than it is in the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Precisely.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pay scale, generally speaking, is based on the same pay scale as in effect in this country, with the proviso that those who are hired in the continental United States to go to Alaska shall receive a 25-percent differential over those who work in the Territory. I think the same also applies to the Territory of Hawaii, where we all know the cost of living is extremely high. I sincerely hope each of you, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, who are behind this amendment and have explained it so fully to this House, will receive the support of the committee and that the amendment will be passed, just because simple justice must be done to the inhabitants of those areas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate that. It does cost more to live in Alaska. Some figures were released 2 weeks ago disclosing that it costs 47 percent more to live in Fairbanks than in Seattle, and 40 percent more in Anchorage. So the allowance does not even cover the increased cost of living.

The hearings disclosed only a reference in a comparatively few words to the situation in Puerto Rico. No mention was made of Alaska or Hawaii. I do not know what the situation is in Puerto Rico. It has been suggested that this should be looked into. We welcome that. If an investigation is held and the committee considers this, it will give us an opportunity to present testimony and to make our case. We have a strong case. We can demonstrate adequately that a cost-of-living allowance is justified.

I think that the committee a week ago yesterday laid the ground work for accepting this amendment, because the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] then said:

I hope that out of the debate today and tomorrow we will have found many reasons for further consideration of constructive, honest legislation which will modify the existing legislation along that line.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. WHITTEN] said:

We contemplate bringing in a bill of general application. Doubtless this provision will have consideration when we come to writing the bill on general application. Certainly they should be treated alike, across the board.

That is all right. Give us a chance to be heard. Give us a chance to have expert witnesses called in. This allowance now is being paid under authority conferred in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1948, as amended. Subsequently Executive Order No. 10000 was issued. Safeguards were set up. I urge the committee to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I agree in the sentiments expressed by the Delegate from Alaska.

In the Territory of Hawaii there are today close to 25,000 civilians in the employ of the Federal Government. The adoption of this section as proposed by the committee would reduce by 20 percent the compensation of only 100 to 150 of that great army of Federal employees. I think it is grossly unfair to the employees of the Department of Agriculture that they should be singled out for this treatment.

The proposal is not only unjust but it is unsound. We know from experience that you cannot operate efficiently and effectively a group of employees in any field of work with part of them receiving 20 percent more compensation than the rest.

At the present time the Federal Government maintains a program for the eradication of the oriental fruitfly. That insect was introduced during the period of the war. Its elimination from Hawaii is important for the protection particularly of the citrus industry of the west coast. There are in the employ of the Department of Agriculture in that project 63 persons; 51 of them are residents of Hawaii; 12 are resident of the States with voting representation in Congress.

What you do by this proposal is to say to those 51 employees who live in Hawaii and maintain their residence there that they are going to have their compensation cut by 20 percent. This is colonialism of the worst sort; it is vicious, nothing less.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understood the gentleman favored the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I favor it, and I hope the committee will support it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentlemen is condemning the provision of the bill which would be amended by the gentleman from Alaska, the one the gentleman from Alaska seeks to strike from the bill.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman for clarifying my position. I approve the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska. I am merely trying to explain to the committee what will happen if Mr. BARTLETT's amendment is not adopted and this provision eliminated from the bill. I do not want to prolong the debate any further, because we reviewed this issue very completely during the course of general debate. I do think that this is no time and this is no way to handle this particular problem and most certainly hope that the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, certainly it is not my desire to hurt anyone. This happens to be the bill that comes before our subcommittee, and insofar as the present is concerned, we are limited to what we can do in connection with the Department of Agriculture. I have been designated to prepare some language of a general nature to be offered at a later date which will be generally applicable throughout the Government.

I know there have been some complaints as a result of pay differentials under present law, and this is what we are trying to stop. Under present law, we pay a native Puerto Rican, a native Alaskan, or a native Hawaiian, a man who has lived there all his life, who has his home there, and to whom that is home, 25 percent more than we pay within the continental United States to people to do the same kind of work. It just does not seem right to me. I want to give people in Territories every chance for fair treatment. I hear from time to time that they do not think they are a part of the United States because of lack of statehood, and we all have our ideas about that. Why should you pay a native of Puerto Rico, who was born there and has his home there, 25 percent more to work in the post office in Puerto Rico than you pay a man to work in the post office in San Francisco, Kalamazoo, or New York? Why should you require the Department under the law to pay them this extra amount? Of course, they have been getting it and they disapprove our stopping that practice. If we are going to follow that practice, why should we not pay a man more to work in New York or in Boston or in the city of Washington? Are we going to pay men 25 percent more to work in New York, 15 percent more to work in Boston and 33 percent more to work in Washington? After all, we are all Americans.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is aware of the fact that under the independent offices appropriation bill the Government does not have to pay that 25 percent; it can pay a lesser amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as I know it is 25 percent except in Hawaii where it is 20 percent. I believe in fair treatment, but special treatment is another matter.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Something has been said about the differential in pay so far as the State Department is concerned. We do have differentials in pay in that Department in cases where Americans work at hardship posts, but we do not pay the natives of those countries a larger amount of money than we do the Americans.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to what the gentleman from Nebraska has said, he is making a comparison between the Americans and natives of a country. Here we are making a comparison between United States citizens.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. This does not have the same effect as where a man goes to some place to work where there is a differential based on hardships. Under this system you would pay certain Americans 25 percent more at their place of residence than you would pay other Americans in continental United States for work at their homes. I think we are sound here. I am sorry that is in this one bill, but I give you my assurance it will be covered in a bill of general application which we hope to report later.

I think the amendment should be defeated. We want to treat everybody alike. We cannot justify a differential between Americans, each of them at home, and start a system where the folks in New York get one salary, the folks in Biloxi, Miss., another salary and in San Francisco another. Under this system that is what you have and we are trying to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARTLETT) there were—ayes 32, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*,

That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 58, after line 4, insert "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Paul Leach, writing in the Detroit Free Press on February 18, 1951, said that the American people are supporting more than 45,000 Federal employees who are engaged directly or indirectly, full or part-time is dispensing information, publicity, and propaganda. This information was supplied by the Budget Bureau more than 2 years ago and since that time the tendency has been to extend these services. Many of the 45,000 are said to be carried on payrolls in capacities other than publicity. They are used part time to further administration or departmental ideas and aims and to stir up protest groups to influence legislation. He also reported that of this 45,000, 8,000 stenographers and information officers are engaged directly in public-relations work. The annual pay runs from $3,000 to $10,300, with a few section chiefs getting $15,000. Six thousand of these employees, the largest group, is on the payroll of the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] just a year ago called attention to the fact that the annual cost of Government printing alone, that is not including original research, writing type, editing, reviewing, and checking is over $50,000. One Government agency admits that editing and preparing copy for the printers costs three times as much as the annual printing. On that basis the cost of Government publicity would run about $200,000,000 annually, but this does not include the cost of research and writing.

I feel sure that the Members of this House do not realize the extent of widespread overlapping in federally owned printing plants and facilities, not only among departments, but in cities throughout the country. Did you know that there are 61 separate Government printing and duplicating plants in Washington; that there are 23 in San Francisco; 25 in Philadelphia; 16 in Chicago; 6 in Kansas City; 6 in Denver; 16 in New York, and many others? The Army and Air Force alone have 140 printing and duplicating plants, the Navy has 87, the Department of Commerce has 26, and the Interior Department has 15.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] also reported that tons and tons of undistributed Government publications are sold as waste paper each year to clear storage space for new publications. In 1947 and 1948 the Government Printing Office condemned more than 10,000,000 copies of publications. Investigators for the Senate Appropriations Committee found as many as 500,000 copies of some publications on hand and 200,000 to 300,000 copies of others.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported this amendment on all bills to which it has been presented, but I think it is particularly appropriate to the Department of Agriculture. I think the Members of this body have not yet forgotten the disgraceful experience of a year ago when the PMA committeemen were called into Minneapolis at the taxpayers expense to form a captive audience to let the Secretary of Agriculture expound his own personal strait-jacket political farm plan and hoped that those people would go to their respective home communities as disciples for that kind of a regimentation plan. Taking their cue from the Secretary himself, top flight officials in the Department of Agriculture are continuing their attempt to use that tax supported agency as a base of operations for the Democratic National Committee. On Tuesday of this week I personally witnessed another episode in that campaign to wed the agencies of the Government to the Democratic National Committee. The occasion was the award ceremony down at the Washington Monument which was held on Tuesday morning. Several Members of Congress, whose constituents were the recipients of awards there, were invited to attend. Dr. Walter Ebling, of the Department of Agriculture, at Madison, Wis., was one of those recipients, and at his suggestion I was happy to go down to the Monument for the ceremonies there. I think the idea of the ceremonies is fine, but I think the Members of Congress from both parties who attended were considerably taken aback when Assistant Secretary Hutchinson, after introducing some of the top executives of the Department and the Members of Congress and their wives who were in attendance, then introduced a certain Mr. Moore, assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Except for those top-flight Agricultural Department employees and except for the Members of Congress, he was the only person there who was so honored as a dignatary. I do not know what his purpose was in introducing that one particular individual, unless it was to make the employees in the Department, who had been released from their regular employment in order to attend that ceremony, believe that, so far as the top-flight officials of the Department were concerned, the executives of the Department of Agriculture and the assistant to the Democratic National Committee were to be on the same plane in their eyes.

I have enough confidence in the people who came there to witness that ceremony to believe that they are not going to be sucked in on that kind of an effort, that they are going to resent that kind of effort. At the same time I think it reflects and is an illustration of this insidious attempt on the part of certain executives in the Department of Agriculture to use propaganda for their own purposes, paid for at the taxpayers' expense. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is indeed appropriate for this Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes, the last minute to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, on each of the appropriation bills this amendment has been presented. I have supported it. The amendment has carried consistently. However, during the debate on the Federal Security Administration-Labor Department appropriation bill the question was raised whether or not the Appropriations Subcommittees were staffed sufficiently to study the matter of Government propaganda and publicity with a view to determining which publications were legitimate statistical reports of the Government, which were propaganda designed to influence public opinion, and which were worthless publications costing the taxpayers a lot of money without any benefit to them and were of little or no public interest.

On that occasion the chairman of the subcommittee said that if the Members of the House would present to him evidence of wasteful and useless propaganda he would get a staff and go into the matter. It occurred to me that we have a committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which is already equipped with the subpena power and the jurisdiction to investigate wasteful expenditures of public funds on publications. Accordingly, on May 14, I addressed a letter to the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and in that two-page letter I requested that his subcommittee look into this matter of expenditures on Government publications and propaganda.

I recommended that we find out: First, the cost to the taxpayers of the paper, the printing, the research and study, the distribution, including an estimate of the cost of franked mail, the cost of storage of the printed material, and general overhead for administrative costs. Second, whether the publication was required by law or whether it was the voluntary activity of a particular agency. Third, an appraisal of the public interest in specific publications. Fourth, a consideration of whether or not the information presently provided by Federal publications could be provided by private sources.

I find that this matter of Government publications has been one of considerable interest over a long period of time. The Senate Appropriations Committee in 1942 made a study of this subject and issued a report. In 1948 the Senate Appropriations Committee again considered the matter of Government propaganda. That committee requested examples of publications from the several agencies of the Government. In pursuance to this request they received about 84,000 different publications, which filled a whole room here in the Capitol Building. Here are a few examples of what we are paying for. Here is one on How To Control Vagrant Cats. Here is another one on Mist Netting for Birds in Japan. Here is another one, Fish for Breakfast, and Why Not? Here is another one on Japanese Ornithology and Mammalogy During World War II. That is the type of thing we are putting out and I think, although there may be some public interest in these publications, someone ought to find out what that public interest is. Someone ought to start calling a halt to theorists drafting studies with little or no public interest at the public expense and consuming thousands and thousands of square feet of storage space, vitally needed in Washington, for old, obsolete publications no longer of any interest to anyone.

I hope the committee will go diligently into the subject and unlike previous investigations of this matter will come up with some concrete recommendations which will start cutting down these Government publications. It is particularly timely in view of the newsprint shortage we have at this time and the great expenditures we must make for our mobilization effort.

I hope the Committee will support this amendment and that in all future appropriation bills similar amendments will be included and that the House will support the Hardy committee, or any other committee that shows any interest in going into this subject. By getting at the facts and the detailed justification in each instance is the only way we can separate worth-while publications from those that are useless, wasteful, and extravagant.

My letter to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HARDY, and his reply to me are as follows:

MAY 14, 1951.

Hon. PORTER HARDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARDY: During the debate on the various appropriation bills the question has arisen regarding the propaganda and publicity activities of the Federal Government. As you are aware in those appropriation bills which have been passed by the House, an amendment has been adopted which prohibits the use of funds appropriated for publicity and propaganda purposes, except those previously authorized by the Congress.

As you are also aware, many publications are available to Congressmen for distribution to their constituents at no charge.

I believe there is a general consensus of opinion among the Members of the Congress that the executive branch of the Government ought not to engage in activities designed to influence public opinion toward some particular national program. I think it would also be the general consensus of opinion of the Members of Congress that there are certain statistical reports and certain scientific and research activities engaged in by the Federal Government which could not very well be duplicated by any nonpublic institution.

It seems to me that the basic question is one of distinguishing between publications which it is right and proper for the agencies of the Federal Government to issue as matters of public interest on the one hand, and those which are either designed to influence public opinion or which are obsolete, wasteful, and of little or no public interest on the other hand.

It is apparent from the outset that any study of Federal publications, designed to separate those which are useful and proper as an expenditure of public funds and those which are wasteful and unnecessary, would require a great many man-hours of careful study on the part of competent and disinterested investigators.

For this reason, I discussed the matter informally with you this morning to ascertain whether or not your subcommittee which, in my opinion, has clear jurisdiction to undertake such an investigation, is adequately staffed to assume this task, and whether or not—assuming the House of Representatives supported you with sufficient funds—you thought it would be a desirable investigation for your subcommittee to pursue. It had been my intention, in case you had indicated that your subcommittee was not interested in pursuing this subject, to suggest some alternate method of exploring this particular activity of the executive branch of the Government.

I was very much gratified to find that you believed this matter was one which ought to be examined by your subcommittee.

It seems to me that there are various aspects of this problem to which attention should be devoted. Undoubtedly, additional questions will arise as any such investigation proceeds.

1. What is the annual cost to the United States taxpayers of the current volume of Federal publications, including: (a) paper and printing; (b) research and study; (c) distribution, including an estimate of the cost of franked mail; (d) storage of printed material; (d) general overhead for administrative costs.

2. Whether publication is required by law, or whether it is the voluntary activity of a particular Federal agency.

3. An appraisal of the public interest in specific publications.

4. Consideration of whether or not the information presently provided by Federal publications could be provided by private sources.

I fully appreciate that this study is of such magnitude that a great deal could not be accomplished within a short period of time. However, it would seem to me that the committee might well concentrate on those publications which appear to have little or no public interest, and which seem to involve a substantial amount of public expenditure, with a view to the early elimination of wasteful and extravagant publications. In this way the work of the committee could begin to bear fruit progressively as it engaged in its undertaking.

I assure you that I shall be only too happy to support any requests for appropriations for a larger staff for your subcommittee in case your committee desires to engage in this investigation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thanks for yours of May 14 discussing in greater detail the suggestion that the subcommittee concern itself with a study of the voluminous publications of the Federal Government.

As I told you in our discussion of this subject, I do consider this an extremely worthwhile suggestion. In fact, as a part of this total picture I have addressed a communication to the Department of Labor relating to certain of its publications. It may be that through correspondence some preliminary data can be secured pending the development of certain activities in which the committee and the staff are now engaged. I think it unwise to undertake any new activity of a scope which you envisioned until after some of our current studies have progressed further.

Additionally, you are somewhat familiar with my current efforts to improve the committee staff organization. Therefore, I wish you would remind me of this suggestion so that we may give further consideration to its initiation as soon as circumstances permit.

Sincerely,

PORTER HARDY, Jr., *Chairman.*

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill already restricts the expenditure of funds for information to work authorized by Congress. It further provides for the transfer of funds to the Office of Information for preparation of exhibits and motion pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress. There is no authority now and there is no money now appropriated under the law for the uses such as the gentleman's amendment would prohibit. If it helps the matter any more to prohibit that which they have no authority to do, I might say if you want to include that language it is all right. There has always been a difference of opinion as to whether in any particular case, in discussing the past as against the future, whether it is propaganda or good, sound argument. That difference of opinion will always exist. But if you want to make it a little stronger by prohibiting that which they have no authority to do, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 58, after line 4 insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or position required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meat inspectors;

"(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(g) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers.

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a similar amendment to the amendment that was adopted by the House on the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the independent offices appropriation bill. However, there is some difference, which I will explain.

As I said before, each amendment must be tailored to fit the particular agency to which it will apply. This amendment exempts seasonal and casual workers in the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service employ during their busiest seasons in the spring and fall, part-time workers who only stay on the job so long as there is work to do. This exemption also exempts fire-fighting temporary employees in the Forest Service, and so forth.

The next exemption eliminates meat inspectors. Meat inspection is necessary for the protection of everybody's health.

The next exemption is the field employees of the Soil Conservation Service, and the Production and Marketing Administration, which provide conservation assistance to the farmers and ranchers. Field employees means all agricultural employees at the county level, including office help. But the employees above the county level are not exempted under my amendment.

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

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

Mr. MARSHALL. The appraisal of land is a seasonal occupation. Would your amendment exempt employees of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farmers Home Administration?

Mr. JENSEN. It exempts all seasonal and casual employees at the county level.

Mr. Chairman, I now have explained the difference between this amendment and the other similar amendments which I have offered and which the House previously has adopted, except in the last proviso where certain unnecessary language has been stricken which appeared in my other amendment of this nature.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just wanted to point out that there is some difference in your amendment as offered today and the amendment you first offered to the first appropriation bill, which was the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. You have eliminated from your amendment casual and seasonal workers. That was the same type of thing we had in the Labor and Federal Security Administration bill, under the Pure Food and Drug Act, where we hired temporary employees for mosquito control, which is the control of malaria in this country, and the gentleman refused to eliminate that and he refused to eliminate the Pure Food and Drug Administration, as he has eliminated the meat inspectors today, which does more for the health and protection of the food that we eat than any other agency.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to elaborate on (d) and also on (g).

Exception (d) is recommended because unhampered seasonal employment authority is essential for handling of peak loads of work which occur in the production of woody plants and grass seed; application of conservation practices, and in farming operations on the research stations. Also in the case of fires on woodland and grassland areas owned by the Government, continuing authority must exist for on-the-spot employment of firefighters.

In connection with exception (g) I want to call attention to the report, page 13, Soil Conservation Service, Salaries and Expenses, which indicates that by the end of the fiscal year 1952 that 300 new soil-conservation districts will have to be served with somewhat less money than was available in the 1950 fiscal year. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture in his Memorandum No. 1278—Coordination of the Department's Agricultural Resources Conservation Services—dated February 15, 1951, has assigned the responsibility for the technical phases of the permanent type soil conservation work on the lands within a county to the Soil Conservation Service technician assigned to that county. This is deemed a highly desirable move on the part of the Secretary since it is aimed at assuring technical services to the agricultural conservation program of PMA for which we are appropriating a very considerable sum of money even with the cut recommended.

Thousands upon thousands of farmers have proved that the surest and safest way to get and maintain high level production from our land is by practicing conservation farming. These same farmers have learned that they use less gas and oil, have less wear of their tractors and farming tools and that they waste less water, time, fertilizer, and seed when they farm the conservation way. A continuing high level farm production is a direct part of defense mobilization, and therefore, the conservation job must go on throughout the entire emergency period. For these reasons I have exempted the field employees—which means employees at the county level—of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance direct to the farmers and ranchers. This exemption will of course also cover the clerical personnel in the field offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I know it is exceedingly popular, and as we come to the conclusion of this debate, I want to say that I hope I have not said things during the consideration of this bill which appeared to be a little sharp, but this is much more serious than the case of where you are just registering a protest against the number of Government employees. The Congress set the number of employees and the number of days and hours per week which they should work. But during this war the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has attempted to exempt those that he can foresee might cause some trouble, but he cannot foresee all of them and he has not.

During this war emergency and in the changed conditions in the last several years we have got several thousand airplanes coming into this country every day from all parts of the world. They are not like ocean ships that have to land at the shore; they land over inside the country, and one out of three has got some insect or something that will do us harm if we let it get loose in this country. This means that even though we have held the total number of inspectors just as tight as we know, it means that only one out of four who may retire, or die, or go into the Army, can be replaced under this bill.

There are other examples just exactly like that. Let me read what this will mean in some instances: Of 153 offices of the Market News Service 103 are filled with only two people; one of these is a market reporter who develops data by visiting market places during trading hours, and the other is a clerk who stays in the office.

Of the 1,614 local offices of the Farmers Home Administration, 1,095 are staffed by only 2 people, a farm management supervisor and a clerk. Do you mean by this amendment that where the supervisor goes into the service for the next year that you can fill only one out of four such vacancies? Are you going to cut the Market News Service? Are you going to cripple all these organizations and stations which are run by two or three people?

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that this amendment permits transfers within the agency. They can do anything they want to; they can take 10 men or a hundred men.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield further. You can if you have the people to take, but when the total number has been reduced as low as it is now, where are you going to transfer them

from? You have got to have some place to transfer them from.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would happen in the case of the forest-fire lookouts during the summer season and fall when the forests are dry? It could mean possibly very large losses.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to be absolutely fair; I want to say that my friend has exempted seasonal and casual workers. But we have got about a thousand forest-ranger districts staffed by permanent employees. During this fear of war we are afraid we may have some atomic bombs dropping on the country, and we have to make a constant effort to obviate damage to our public domain. What are you going to do? Only one out of four forest rangers who are separated from the service can be replaced. The gentleman says you can transfer them. Yes; transfer them from some other district, and what would that mean?

Then you have meat inspection; meat inspection is exempted; everybody is scared to fool with meat inspection. But we still have this amendment applying to our inspectors of livestock in the lots; they are not exempted from the provisions of this amendment.

Hog cholera research, where the work is carried on by one man cooperating with State experimental stations in the various States. Now, listen; you farmers know well how every year on our subcommittee one man after another wants something; to one it is tobacco; to another it is grapes; to another it is something in Lower California; little one- and two-man stations which are vital to an industry in a given area.

My friend by his amendment would say that only 1 out of 4 vacancies could be filled. What confusion it would cause. He says we could take them from elsewhere in the agency; we have not got them in the agency.

If you defeat this amendment, you are not voting to keep this Federal employment at a high rate. The record shows that since 1940 we have reduced the permanent employees of the Department of Agriculture from 808,000 down to less than 65,000. That is a good record. Do not close up house on your little stations in this country and then ask why the folks are getting on your back in your industries or you will be in trouble at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 123, noes 108.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. JENSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 93.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week as well as next week, if he can so inform us.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the completion of the bill under consideration today there will be no program for the remainder of the week. I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

On Monday next there will be the call of the Consent Calendar with one suspension on S. 435, war-risk insurance for air commerce. I understand there is a unanimous commitee report, and it is quite important to get it through. There is no change in organic law to speak of, but it was not out of committee for 3 days to get on the Consent Calendar. The chances are that it will go through by unanimous consent, but I will put it down as a suspension, thus advising the Members that it will come up in any event.

There is a conference report which, if filed, will come up, but I do not know whether it will come up on Monday or not; if the chairman of the committee desires, it will come up on Monday.

If there are any roll calls, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I have conferred and agreed that they will go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is quite all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tuesday and thereafter, until disposed of, we will take up H. R. 3791, the India emergency food relief bill, and after that H. R. 314, the Booker T. Washington Hospital of the Veterans' Administration. Any other program for next week, if any, will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The India relief bill has 6 hours for general debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 58, line 5, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 410 (a) Except as hereinafter provided, reductions in each appropriation, reappropriation, loan and contract authorization or reauthorization contained in this act are hereby made in the total amount resulting from the application of the percentages indicated herein to the amounts of obligations for the fiscal year 1952, if any, included in the President's budget estimates on which each such appropriation, reappropriation, loan and contract authorization or reauthorization is based, for the following objects:

"Travel, 20 percent.

"Transportation of things, 10 percent.

"Communication services, 10 percent.

"Rents and utility services, 10 percent.

"Printing and reproduction, 10 percent.

"Other contractual services, 10 percent.

"Supplies and materials, 10 percent.

"Equipment, 10 percent.

"Lands and structures, 10 percent.

"Grants, subsidies, and contributions, 10 percent.

"(b) Amounts specifically authorized in this act to be transferred from one account to another, and limitations on such transfers, shall be subject to reduction as specified in this section only before such transfer is made, such reductions to be based on the schedules of obligations by objects, wherever appearing in the President's budget estimates, relating to such amounts.

"(c) For the purposes of this section the term 'President's budget estimates' shall be deemed to include the annual budget for the fiscal year 1952, any supplemental estimates transmitted to the Congress, and any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates.

"SEC. 411. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

"(a) Trust funds.

"(b) Funds received as payments in advance or otherwise for supplies furnished or services rendered.

"(c) Funds for Government corporations other than those made available in this act for administrative expenses or by direct appropriation for the general fund of the Treasury.

"(d) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorization, and obligated balances of reappropriations.

"SEC. 412. Reductions below the amount of the President's budget estimates as made by any other section of this act in any appropriation, reappropriation, loan or contract authorization or reauthorization, or transfer authority contained herein shall be credited toward the respective reductions directed by this section."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It requires the exercise of additional duties not required by any other law. Further, it is not protected by the Holman rule because any retrenchment of expenditures by the amendment is purely speculative, for any cuts are to be made on the basis of the figures in the President's budget. You cannot look at the bill and at the amendment and tell whether the amendment would reduce expenditures. This means it is speculative, and is not protected by the Holman rule. The bill now pending before the committee specifies certain amounts for specified purposes. There is nothing in the bill before us which would indicate in the least whether it is a reduction, addition to, or anything else as far as the President's budget is concerned. The amendment which has been offered attempts to make reductions on the basis of figures in the President's budget, but that is not before us. I respectfully submit that while there may be retrenchment under the Holman rule, it has to be entirely apparent on the face of the amendment, rather than speculative. Therefore, the amendment is not saved by that rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. The reductions are absolutely specific in every instance, and the amount to which the reduction would apply is absolutely specific. Therefore, it is not speculative in the slightest degree. The reductions that are submitted

are in different items of services, and other expenses that relate to the bill. There is no question at all of any speculation of the requirement of additional duties anywhere.

Mr. WHITTEN. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, duties additional to those imposed by any other law are required under the terms of the amendment—they are required even to effectuate the provisions of the amendment. The amendment does not name amounts or page and line numbers. Someone has to try to figure out how much money would be appropriated by the bill if the amendment were to become a part of the bill. That surely imposes on someone the duty of making computations, and the imposition of such duties is clearly sufficient to bring the amendment into the category of legislation.

Who can look at the bill before the House and look at the amendment which is before us and state the amount by which the amendment reduces the bill, if any? I cannot state the amount the amendments reduces the bill, or whether it reduces the bill. I may think it makes a reduction and a retrenchment—the author of the amendment may be confident that it does so. But under the precedents of the House if there is any doubt about retrenchment, then the amendment cannot be protected by the Holman rule. Notwithstanding the fact that the amendment starts off by saying that reductions are made, it would be necessary in order to compute the amount of the reductions to use something that is not here—it is not before us. In fact, some of it does not even exist.

Subsection c of the amendment says that the term "President's budget estimates" shall be deemed to include the annual budget and any supplemental estimates transmitted to Congress and also any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates. Those supplemental estimates can come here a month from now, and we can be confident that there will yet be amendments to the budget for 1952. They could reduce the budget as well as increase it. How can you base reductions on something that does not even exist yet? The amendment itself defines the term President's budget estimates" to include "any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates." If I publish a statement showing the objects of expenditure for every item in this bill to be zero—and say that it is the way some people would want it—would that not be "information related to the President's budget estimates"? If that information conflicts with the budget submitted by the President, which prevails? How could there be a more vague and indefinite reference?

Now tie all this in with the last proviso of this amendment. That states that reductions below the amount of the President's budget estimates as made by any other section of the act in any appropriation, et cetera, shall be credited toward the respective reductions directed by this amendment. The committee cut this bill 12.2 percent below the budget before it. If you credit this cut made by the committee to the reductions directed by this amendment, I believe you would have a net increase in the bill as it now stands. How does that work out so as to retrench expenditures? Surely, any retrenchment is speculative, and under the precedents that means the point of order must be sustained.

Under the precedents and the rules, the Chair may look only to what is properly of record in the pending bill, which is the bill under consideration, the law of the land and the practice of the House. The budget is not here—in fact some of it may not even exist yet, under the definition in the amendment itself.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has already referred to it, but I would like to emphasize that the budget of the President and the budget estimates in relation to the Department of Agriculture are not before the House of Representatives. The House is now considering a bill, and the estimates as contained in the budget are simply sent here and referred to the Committee on Appropriations for its consideration as a piece of evidence and no more. We are not considering the budget estimate. We are considering a bill. How an amendment can relate to budget estimates and yet be germane to the pending bill is not quite clear to me. It seems to me that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Mississippi is well taken on the two grounds he has mentioned, that it is not a limitation of expenditures for the reasons he has stated and also that it is not saved by the Holman rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the amendment before me, but I recall there is reference in it to cutting the bill. But the formula used in cutting the bill is in relation to the President's budget and by applying the provisions of the amendment to that budget. I respectfully submit that while there may be that reference in the amendment to cutting the bill, it does not change the force of the argument which I advanced that the budget is not before the House and therefore the amendment is not in order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard a little further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget was submitted to the Congress about the 20th of January, and of course it is presently before the Congress. The intent of this amendment is to reduce travel expenditures where they are above 20 percent below the President's budget on that item of traveling. On the other things it is absolutely specific. It does not in the slightest degree or in any case increase an item, but it would prohibit an expenditure of more than a certain percent on each item below the President's budget as submitted to us. There can be no question but what it is entirely within the purview of the rule and that it is entirely specific and does not require additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard just briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to call the attention of the Chair, if I may, to the fact that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has said, the President's budget is a part of the official records of this House and is used constantly by the House as a guide and an official document. This amendment that has been submitted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] simply places a limitation upon the appropriation bill and gives a directive as to how the funds shall be expended, using as a guide only the figures set out in the President's budget. Therefore, the amendment should be in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point is made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that the budget is before the Congress. That does not hold true in this instance, because this is not the House meeting as the House. It is the Committee of the Whole, and the Committee is meeting to consider a bill having to do with appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

After very serious study on this amendment, the Chair is of the opinion that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the question then arises as to whether it is protected by the Holman rule. That rule requires the legislation to make a retrenchment of expenditures beyond doubt. Since this amendment operates against the budget estimates rather than the amounts in the bill, the question of retrenchment is speculative.

Therefore, the Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is legislation upon an appropriation bill and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry my amendment was not ruled germane. My approach to this is entirely apart from agriculture or any other field. The fact remains that the Department of Agriculture is the only department according to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report that has accomplished zero percent of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The recommendations all lie along the line of improving the administration of the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am in accord with some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. However, I cannot help but say that I doubt that you ought to saddle that on the Department. The Congress has to change the law. For the time being they have to operate under the law as it is.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not agree with that. A great many recommendations can be made and a great many reductions should be made through administrative procedure. Further it behooves the executive department to submit something to Congress in the way of recommendations to act upon. In fact the Reorganization Act calls upon the Executive to submit reorganization plans to the Congress.

The Hoover Commission recommendations for the Department of Agriculture would save about $80,000,000. The amendment I sought to offer would have reduced the budget by about $70,000,000, which would have been in accord with the idea of the Hoover Commission to put the Department on a business basis.

Further, I want to state that unless the Congress is ready and willing to do something, when a department has so thumbed its nose at the people's desire for economy and efficiency, and this Congress, by refusing to comply with any of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and has a zero percentage of compliance, there is no chance of ever controlling Federal expenditures. Something should be done by this Congress. One thing that can be done is when an appropriation bill comes around we can cut the appropriation and so accomplish that purpose. That was the purpose of my amendment.

The amendment I proposed to the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1952 would have reduced the appropriation in the President's budget estimates by $89,000,000. With the amendments proposed heretofore and adopted this would result in a net cut of around $70,000,000 in the bill. The cut is a percentage cut across the board on all administrative items plus a percentage cut on the general item "Grants, subsidies, and contributions" as set out on page 1123 of the hearings before the subcommittee.

The wording of this amendment is the result of some considerable study and research on the part of various persons interested in it. It seeks to eliminate the objections raised to the Thomas-Taber amendment in Senate conference in the Eighty-first Congress. Furthermore, it is restricted to an appropriation bill for a single department and is accordingly itemized.

I cannot understand the Chair's ruling in light of these facts and the further facts that the President's Budget is set out in both the subcommittee printed hearings and the printed report No. 421 accompanying H. R. 3973.

Frankly, on general principles, I am opposed to percentage cut amendments. They are too apt to cut the good along with the bad.

However, I support this amendment on the very strong basis that the Department of Agriculture according to the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is the only Cabinet department in which no basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission have been applied by legislation, reorganization plan, or administrative action. The committee, of which I am a member, Executive Expenditures, has the job to further the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Most of you have read the very detailed report of the Hoover Commission and its active subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture. It was made by men who knew their field. It is fair and it is sound. It is estimated that at least $80,000,000 could be saved annually by the Department of Agriculture if its recommendations were adopted. Furthermore, an annual rescission of $135,000,000 could be made to the Federal Treasury and $2,530,000,000 returned to the Treasury almost immediately through liquidations, and relinquishment of certain borrowing powers.

The question before the House, as I have said, is this, are we going to permit a department of the executive branch of our Government to thumb its nose at the people and the Congress in these days when we so badly need to restrict waste and inefficiency?

What will be the effect on the executive branch of the Government if this Congress permits a governmental department to get by unchecked when it has a zero record of compliance with sound recommendations for efficiency and economy, which incidentally will not impair any of the services now being performed, but in fact will enhance them through more efficient operation? Will there be any incentive for the further compliance by the Federal agencies with the Hoover Commission recommendations if the Congress sits idly by and fails to take the one kind of action it has available? That action I need hardly state is to cut the appropriation of the agency when the opportunity comes around. The opportunity is now here.

In my opinion a vote for this amendment is a vote for the Hoover Commission's objectives. A vote against this amendment renders ineffectual the great work of this Commission and of the Congress which set it up.

The subcommittee's cuts, it should be noted, have little or nothing to do with the cuts proposed in this amendment: $80,000,000 of the subcommittee's total cut of roughly $100,000,000 concerns three items: a $32,700,000 item which merely changes the bookkeeping and the other two items which cut back specific programs—see schedule pages 32 and 35 of subcommittee report.

The amount proposed to be cut from Agriculture's budget by this amendment is less than the amount that Agriculture can save by putting its house in order. Let me read the general findings of the Hoover Commission on the deficiencies of the Department of Agriculture:

Our task force on agricultural activities enumerates the following faults in the organization of the Department:

(a) Its rapid growth has resulted in some 20 different offices reporting directly to the Secretary, causing an unnecessary diffusion of authority.

(b) The Department has grown to its present size without sufficient integration of its parts and with considerable overlap and duplication. It is a loose confederation of independent bureaus and agencies.

(c) There are agricultural activities in other parts of the Government which overlap and duplicate those of the Department of Agriculture.

(d) The Cooperative Extension Service established by the Federal Government and the States for educational purposes is being increasingly bypassed by several of the bureaus and agencies of the Department.

(e) With the rapid growth of new activities, many field organizations at State and county levels have developed. Their work results in duplications, overlappings, and often conflicting policies. They confuse and multiply the difficulties of the farmer in his relations to the Department.

(f) The Department has organized a variety of local advisory committees at the county level, and their members tend to become local administrators of uncoordinated agencies instead of advisers.

(g) The inspection of agricultural products for protection of the consumer and the farmer is scattered through many agencies of the Government, and the resulting confusion requires producers and manufacturers to comply with regulations issued by agencies of two or more departments or administrations.

(h) The present systems of budgeting, treatment of intradepartmental funds, and earmarking of recurring funds have the cumulative effect of obscuring bureau expenditures and of promoting waste.

(i) The services and policies of the several farm credit agencies overlap. Their organization is contrary to sound banking principles. Some of them make loans which require costly individual supervision.

CONCLUSIONS

These recommendations, if accepted, would result in the elimination of overlap and conflict. They are designed to give greater efficiency and economy to the administration of the Department. Estimates, which are admittedly approximations, have been made of the amounts which might be saved by taking the actions recommended. The tabulation on page 95 of the report of our task force on agricultural activities reveals that the total specific annual savings in operating expenses by functional reorganization, as estimated by the task force, amount to over $44,000,000.

Further, by adoption of our recommendations as to credit agencies an annual saving of more than $36,000,000 can be made to the Government, the Government losses on loans can be lessened, and the Government capital now employed by lending agencies can be reduced.

Consequential returns can be made to the Treasury of funds now in the hands of agricultural credit agencies, and by the reduction of borrowing authorities.

This Commission believes useless duplication to the citizen will be eliminated, and economy to both the Government and the citizen will result from these recommendations.

If ever there was an opportunity to put yourself on record for efficiency and economy, it was now. However, the adverse ruling by the Chair has deprived us all of this opportunity.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COST OF RAISING BEEF

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been charged that representatives of the livestock-producing industry made a very bad case for themselves in a recent public meeting here in Washington. It is charged that they were unable to answer

certain questions regarding the cost of producing livestock. However, there is another delegation in Washington at this time, headed by Frederick Sherer, president of the Nebraska's Feeder Association, who has presented a full study and analysis of beef-production costs to many Members of the House and the Senate. The final calculations of the study were made by a committee of the association, with William S. Brown, of Sioux City, Iowa, livestock market, as chairman. This study gives full detail in nine exhibits, and the explanations of these exhibits, in my opinion, answer most of the questions which were not answered at the recent public hearing here in Washington. Mr. Sherer and his associates are appearing before the House Committee on Agriculture and also the House Committee on Banking and Currency, during which time the beef-production costs will be explained in detail. Fearing, however, that very few Members of the House will be given the opportunity to study these exhibits, I include the explanations as part of my remarks:

"When you can measure what you are speaking about, and express it in numbers, you know something about it; but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind."—Selected.

With this thought in mind the following exhibits have been prepared to show the costs involved in cattle-feeding operations. From a study of these exhibits a measure can be made on the over-all costs involved in cattle feeding. One of the basic fallacies of Ceiling Price Regulation 23 dated April 30, 1951, issued by the Office of Price Stabilization is the lack of consideration given to the costs involved in producing the gain on cattle in the feed lot.

EXPLANATIONS OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No. 1. This exhibit is a recapitulation of basic data obtained from 20 different farmer feeders. These men prepared individual forms and the costs shown in this exhibit are actual costs as per their own experience. Out of some 300 separate cost sheets submitted, 20 were selected for the basis of this exhibit. These were more or less selected at random but an effort was always made to take the most conservative and reasonable set of costs for this study. In most cases the operations studied consisted of cattle now actually in the feed lot and are being headed for the late spring or summer market.

Exhibit No. 2. This exhibit is set up on the basis of an analysis of cost components and is comparable to a cost accounting sheet of a factory operation. All figures used are based on the data spread in exhibit No. 1. In a sense exhibit No. 2 is a study of a beef factory and should be analyzed as such. It should be noted that the gain cost in this exhibit is $35.619 per hundredweight to break even and $36.643 per hundredweight in order to yield a profit of $23.26 per head. This $23.26 per head is about 5 percent of the break-even cost of the finished steer which costs $424.96 per head to build. If the formula of cost plus 10 percent were followed, the steer should show a per head profit of $42.49. To yield this, it would have to sell approximately $2 per hundredweight higher than the figure shown of $36.643, the necessary selling price required to recover out-of-pocket expense and provide a profit of $23.26 per head. The Ceiling Price Regulation 23 order reflects around a 20-percent roll-back on selling prices as of October 1, 1951, compared to actual selling levels the date of issuance of the order, April 30. Yet, no provision is made to roll back the gain costs 20 percent. Many experienced cattle feeders state that this gain cost will increase, not decrease. (See last paragraph of Exhibit No. 8) if such is the case, production will be sharply curtailed and in some instances stopped.

Exhibit No. 3. This exhibit is a per head breakdown of costs based on the factual information gathered from the farmer feeder. This is the same information on a per head basis as shown in exhibit No. 2. This exhibit follows the same pattern of set-up as the form prepared by the feeder himself, and is a composite on the 1,742 head shown from the 20 different operations on a per head basis. The provision for a profit of $23.26 per head is very low and many operators would not be satisfied with this, nevertheless, in the lots tested this in the mean figure resulting from the actual figure specified by the men themselves.

Exhibit No. 4. This exhibit shows the break-even cost calculation, also the total amount to be recovered. The basis for these calculations appear in exhibits Nos. 2 and 3. The miscellaneous calculations in this exhibit show that the per bushel yield of beef to be 7.3 pounds. This yield would not be possible except for the fact that some of the operations used in these exhibits (No. 2 and No. 3) are a grass-feeding project which of course, "stretches" the corn. Such a yield from 1 bushel of corn would not be possible in a late fall or winter-feeding program when no grass is available. It is interesting to note that the average daily gain is 2.27 pounds which shows the operators made no attempt to minimize the gain for the feed fed.

Exhibit No. 5. This exhibit is a spread of factual information taken off of actual reports turned in by 18 different feeders. The 18 lots tested in this and exhibit No. 4 are separate and apart from those shown in exhibits No. 2 and No. 3. The purpose of this exhibit is to show that costs are much higher in certain operations than others, particularly so when contrasted to those used in the first three exhibits. Note that the cost of gain on these cattle is $43.60 per hundredweight. These cattle were fed strictly in the dry lot (no grass) and high-priced rations.

Exhibit No. 6. This exhibit shows the per head analysis of costs involved based on data in exhibit No. 5. This exhibit compares to exhibit No. 4, only on different lots of cattle tested. This calculation shows that the animal must sell for $38.30 to recover out-of-pocket expenses and produce a profit. By comparison this shows that gain costs to break even are $43.60 per hundredweight compared to $35.62 in exhibit No. 4. It has to be admitted that the cattle tested in exhibits No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 show very low costs and are very conservative; also that the experiences of many other feeders show that out-of-pocket costs are much higher.

Exhibit No. 7. This exhibit is self-explanatory. The main difference between this exhibit and the preceding is that this reflects a completed operation. Note dates of the feeding period. These costs are actual experience of a commercial operator in Nebraska. Note that the gain cost is $39.70 per hundredweight on 2,162 head out of 6 different lots.

Exhibit No. 8. This exhibit is self-explanatory and also reflects a completed operation of a commercial feeder in Colorado. Note his per hundredweight gain cost of $40.99 to break even.

Exhibit No. 9. This exhibit shows the selling prices of live cattle at the various dates as indicated in the column headings. The prices that become effective August 1, 1951, are 4½ percent lower than the May 20 level. The October 1, 1951, price schedule is around 4½ percent under the August 1 level. The October 1 level will reflect approximately 120 percent to 125 percent of parity according to ceiling price regulation 23.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Naturally, I accept the ruling of the Chair. But I respectfully say, in view of the possibility of a similar point of order, any time in the future, what I tried to say to the Chair before he ruled: If he will look on page 1 of the bill he will see that when a bill comes to this floor it carries with it a report, and the report number is printed on the face of the bill. The report, accompanying H. R. 3973, on page 34, carries the figures of the President's budget, and compares them with the figures in this bill. Therefore, I tried to say to the Chair that the President's budget is a part of this bill before us.

I am afraid this ruling is an example of the effect of the so-called functional budget, and suggests one difficulty of saving money under a functional budget. I think that is something for us to consider as other bills come to the floor.

INCREASE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to me to know that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is at the present time conducting hearings on amending the Railroad Retirement Act. Probably no group of people in the United States are more in need of immediate consideration by the Congress than those unfortunates living on fixed incomes in this time of inflationary pressures. Those who are receiving benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act are, of course, among this group and are suffering great hardship.

I feel certain that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce made up as it is of experts in the field of railroad retirement, will expeditiously report a bill granting relief for the railroad pensioners. It is my sincere hope that in framing a bill that the committee will give serious consideration to the problem of men who have retired under the railroad retirement system who have wives to support. As we all know, the Congress in its wisdom, in amending the Social Security Act in 1939, recognized the additional financial responsibility of an annuitant burdened with the responsibility of caring for a wife. Therefore, in the social security field we have established a principle of allowing a married annuitant a financial consideration to enable him to meet his responsibility.

H. R. 3669, as proposed by the Railway Labor Executives' Association, takes steps to correct this problem as it affects railroad employees. This bill makes an allowance for the spouse of an annuitant of one-half his annuity up to a maximum of $50. It seems to me only fair that the Congress apply the same principle in the field of railroad retirement that it has seen fit to apply in social security.

There is no question but what the needs of single annuitants and married annuitants are dissimilar. Consideration for the wife in the manner prescribed by H. R. 3669 is an equitable approach. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will adopt this feature when it reports a bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a further brief announcement to the House. It was intended to bring up this afternoon House Resolution 158 to authorize the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of the said committee. Instead of bringing that up there will be called up House Concurrent Resolution 100, to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantini Brumidi. I understand there is no objection to this resolution. House Resolution 158 will be called up on Monday.

I wanted to make this announcement so the Members would understand the situation.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jensen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 58, after line 4 insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or position required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meet inspectors;

"(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(g) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers.

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. JENSEN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with but that it be printed.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on this I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 153, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—216

Aandahl
Abbitt
Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bakewell
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Brambiett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Budge
Buffett
Burleson
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Case
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cooper
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dempsey
Denny
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Donovan
Doughton
Elston
Engle
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Gossett
Graham
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hand
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Hébert
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Hunter
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Woodrow W.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kennedy
Kilburn
LeCompte
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara
Ostertag
Patten
Patterson
Phillips
Pickett
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Rankin
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Robeson
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stefan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson, Mich.
Tollefson
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vaughn
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Weichel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.

NAYS—153

Addonizio
Albert
Allen, La.
Anfuso
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Burdick
Burnside
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Crosser
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Gore
Granger
Grant
Greenwood
Gregory
Hardy
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Holifield
Howell
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, Hamilton C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
King
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Lucas
McCarthy
McCormack
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan
McMullen
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Mills
Mitchell
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Philbin
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rhodes
Riley
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sasscer
Shelley
Sieminski
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Sutton
Tackett
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Watts
Welch
Whitaker
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Winstead
Withrow
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—63

Adair
Angell
Bailey
Baker
Barden
Beamer
Bonner
Bosone
Bray
Brooks
Brownson
Buckley
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Chudoff
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Corbett
Crumpacker
Dawson
Deane
Dingell
Dorn
Eaton
Ellsworth
Gillette
Goodwin
Granahan
Green
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Harvey
Hedrick
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Johnson
Judd
Kersten, Wis.
Kilday
Kirwan
Latham
Lyle
McGrath
Magee
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Murray, Wis.
O'Neill
Perkins
Poage
Redden
Richards
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Secrest
Sheppard
Stanley
Stockman
Vinson
Wood, Idaho
Woodruff
Yates

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. McGrath against.
Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Granahan against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Jackson of Washington against.
Mr. Crumpacker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Green against.
Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Brooks against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Roberts against.
Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Redden against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Perkins against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. O'Neil against.
Mr. Goodwin for, with Mr. Deane against.
Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mrs. Bosone against.
Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Wood of Idaho.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill just passed the enrolling clerk be authorized to make any necessary correction of section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

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. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this House ought to work now and get out of here in July.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILBURN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I state to the gentleman from New York that there is no further legislation this week.

Mr. KILBURN. What about the aid to India bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is to be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. KILBURN. Why not take it up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter for the leadership on this side to program. It is done after consultation. All you are doing is to force the Members to come back here tomorrow to adjourn.

Mr. KILBURN. I will not object this time, but I am serving notice that we ought to work and get out of here.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are ready to work. We are caught up on everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is not anything to prevent any Member working on his committee work or attending to his office work, if he wants to work, is there?

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a resolution (H. Res. 235) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives of the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

CHARGES AGAINST DR. JOSEPH W. WEINBERG

Mr. VELDE. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of contempt-of-court charges against Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg in Judge Holtzoff's court, in my opinion, calls up an immediate need for a review of the case by the Department of Justice, as recommended by the Un-American Activities Committee by a unanimous vote that Dr. Weinberg be investigated with view to perjury indictment.

I have no quarrel with the ruling of Judge Holtzoff. I am not too familiar with the details of the contempt charge on which Weinberg was acquitted, but feel that the ruling was made on ample legal precedent. A reading of the testimony of Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg when he appeared before the Un-American Activities Committee in 1949 and 1950 should convince any fair-minded person that Dr. Weinberg is not cooperating with his Government providing all the details of his connections with Steve Nelson and other members of the Communist Party in the San Francisco Bay area during his employ in the University of California Radiation Laboratories as a nuclear physicist. A further reading of the testimony of witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee, especially that of Mr. James Sterling Murray, would indicate that Weinberg had many connections with Steve Nelson and other Communist Party members, which he has thus far denied. So I urge the Department of Justice, with the help of the FBI, to renew their efforts to bring before a grand jury the full facts concerning Weinberg. It has been a year and 10 months now since the Un-American Activities Committee unanimously recommended consideration by the Department of Justice of Weinberg's testimony. We should not allow this matter to be delayed any further.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 3587, the third supplemental appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF NORWAY'S INDEPENDENCE DAY—A TRIBUTE TO THE NORWEGIAN PEOPLE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, today is an occasion of celebration on the part of a great people. It is the birthday of Norwegian independence. On May 17, 1814, at Eidsvold, Norway, the Norwegians obtained their own independence and adopted a constitution patterned somewhat largely after our own, which we adopted 27 years before.

My own State, and my own congressional district, know these people from Norway and their descendants, to as great a degree, I believe, as any other State. These immigrants of Norway readily assimilated and prized their American citizenship; they took great pride and an active part as American citizens, and their contributions are

recognized as of the highest order. They sought education; they were highly religious; they willingly shared responsibilities of citizenship and they were inculcated with a sincerity of purpose in their everyday lives that was most admirable.

When these early Norwegian immigrants came to America, they were not seeking an easy way of life. They took their families into the wilderness, and out of that wilderness carved their destiny. Their first construction was their homes, and then the building of schools and places of worship. The development of the great Northwest is due, in large part, to the Scandinavian people who came here to make their homes and become an integral part of America.

These sons of Norway who came here, were already inculcated with the principles of freedom, justice, and independence. They became a part of, and added to, our own American culture. They became governors, State legislators, and Members of Congress, and they received appointments to high judicial offices and educational institutions. Many of my colleagues of the House are of Norwegian descent.

Norway is a small country in the family of nations, and as a nation has been faced with the problem of sustaining its economy under adversity. The world was shocked on April 9, 1940, when Norway was overrun by the war machine of the Nazis. However, the spirit of these Norwegian people was never conquered and we all rejoice that Norway has been restored to her place of freedom. That fact, in the light of present world affairs, should be a lesson to any would-be aggressor with designs to conquer this great people.

I join with our fellow American citizens of Norwegian descent in congratulating Norway upon the occasion of her independence day. It is appropriate to extend to the Norwegian people the felicitations of one freedom-loving country to another.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1951.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The Clerk is in receipt of a motion to close the hearing and print the record without delay, by the contestee in the contested election case of *W. Kingsland Macy* v. *Ernest Greenwood* for a seat in the Eighty-second Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of New York, now in progress under the statutes relating to such cases.

Since this motion contemplates action which can only be directed by the House itself, the letter and accompanying motion of the contestee in this case are transmitted for consideration.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 100.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare plans for and to hold an appropriate ceremony in honor of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall while working on the rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol. Such ceremony shall be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on July 26, 1951, the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, or on such other day as the committee herein provided for may designate. The committee shall extend invitations to attend the ceremony to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Ambassador of Italy, and such other public officials and persons in private life as the committee may select.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday and Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include a table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PMA

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call attention to statements made on the floor of the House today concerning the appropriation for PMA, or better known as AAA funds.

Because I was unwilling to pay millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury to owners of large tracts of land for conserving their own soil, it was suggested that I might be sniping at a farm program.

It seems to me, and I am sure the participants who get these large payments are in accord with my view, that they ought to be willing to reduce their payments to $750, because they would still get that much under my amendment, rather than ask the Federal Treasury for this money.

I have always favored more liberal payments to the little fellow, the one who now gets less than $50 for soil conservation, it being my contention that a man who would qualify for as much as $2,500 or as much as $1,000, ought to conserve his own soil without this extra help. So I ask those of you who are so much interested in the big payments this afternoon to take a look at a table I have inserted in the RECORD. I think you will agree with me that you have not done much for the ordinary, average farmer, even in this appropriation of a quarter of a million dollars.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an obituary notice of the death of Colonel Legendre, who was very active in Legion circles, and a great patriot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the San Diego Union entitled "The Great Decline."

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain statistical material.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter to Mrs. Kee.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain statistics on beef production.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in three instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. POULSON) was given permission to extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include correspondence, a part of which he read.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article regarding a paralyzed veteran who has accomplished wonders, who has written music that has been played by the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the American Veterans of World War II of Atlantic, Iowa, and Walnut, Iowa, and a resolution adopted by this organization.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ENGLE), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for Thursday, May 17, 1951, on account of illness.

To Mr. STIGLER, for 1 week, beginning Monday, May 21, 1951, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 16, 1951:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

On May 17, 1951:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 21, 1951, 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:

458. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 26, 1950, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 134); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with eight illustrations.

459. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Van Ness Street between Connecticut Avenue and Reno Road NW."; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

460. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of joint resolution 8 enacted by the Legislature of Hawaii, relative to restoring to its previous status under the control of the Territory certain Hawaiian home lands required for use by the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

461. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a letter relative to receipt of a motion to close the hearing and print the record of the contested election case of W. Kingsland Macy versus Ernest Greenwood for a seat in the Eighty-second Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of New York (H. Doc. No. 135); to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed.

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. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Sylvio Latino; with amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; with amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2406. A bill for the relief of B. H. Manley; without amendment

(Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3950. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 15. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 482). 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. BATTLE:

H. R. 4135. A bill to authorize adjustments of rentals paid for premises leased for use during a national emergency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4136. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4137. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4138. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4139. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the acts of September 23, 1950, and September 30, 1950, providing financial assistance to local educational agencies so as to remove discrimination against larger school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4140. A bill to change penalties for the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4141. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4142. A bill to authorize creation of a National Commission of Decency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4143. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4144. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4145. A bill to amend sections 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1309) and section 446 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1446); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4146. A bill to provide for the granting of financial aid to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4147. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4148. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the apportionment of Representatives among the several States on the basis of the number of citizens of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Teheran should be forthwith repudiated by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. Res. 231. Resolution expressing it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that Secretary of State Dean Acheson should be removed from office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 232. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to the estate of Robert D. Johnson, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 233. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and studies authorized by House Resolution 158; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Res. 234. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the utilization of military manpower by the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, requesting the return to New Jersey and to other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the States for the administration of the employment security program, so as to provide adequately for administration of the unemployment compensation law in the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4149. A bill for the relief of Maria (Henriette) Zagrabowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4150. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to Ted B. Landoe and Roderic S. Carpenter; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4151. A bill for the relief of Stevan Pivnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 4152. A bill for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of Isaac H. Shohet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 4154. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4155. A bill for the relief of the minor child, "Kim," a Korean war orphan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4156. A bill for the relief of Carmen Salvador and her daughter Ruby Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. R. 4157. A bill for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrska, Sister Anna Gluchowska and Sister Bronislawa Szewczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4158. A bill for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4159. A bill for the relief of Georgette J. Zacarias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4160. A bill for the relief of M'Dahoma Ahmed Kouva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 4161. A bill for the relief of Beatrice O. Haidostian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 4162. A bill for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4163. A bill for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires of Eastover, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4164. A bill for the relief of Danuta Resizke Birke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4165. A bill for the relief of A. D. Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 4166. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Escobar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4167. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Rea D. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4168. A bill for the relief of M. L. Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

287. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of William W. Mitchell and others concerning abuse of Presidential powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by American Hard Rubber Co., Butler, N. J.; Woman's Club of Little Falls, Little Falls, N. J.; Paterson League for the Hard of Hearing, Paterson, N. J.; Raymond Pellington Unit No. 77, American Legion Auxiliary, Paterson, N. J.; Wanaque Borough Woman's Club, Wanaque Borough, N. J.; Saint Mary's Hospital Senior Guild, Passaic, N. J.; Hawthorne Junior Woman's Club, Hawthorne, N. J.; and Ladies Auxiliary William B. Mawhinney Post No. 1593, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hawthorne, N. J.; reaffirming faith in the American voluntary way to

safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally opposes any form of national compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

289. Also, concurrent resolution passed by New Jersey State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to New Jersey and to other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the States for the administration of the employment security program, so as to provide adequately for administration of the unemployment compensation law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

290. By Mr. MILLER of New York: Resolution unanimously adopted by the United Polish Organizations at a mass meeting commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, May 3, 1791, held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

291. By Mr. HART: Petition of United Automobile Aircraft Agricultural Implement Workers of America to cancel regulation issued by President Truman and Gen. Lewis Hershey granting blanket deferment to college students etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 21, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

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:

Almighty God and Father of all mankind, whose paths are mercy and truth, before the white splendor of whose purity every vileness must shrink away: Lift us, we pray Thee, above the immediate and temporary and set our lives in the wide horizons of abiding verities. As Thy servants, and the people's, in this temple of democracy, save us from the perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. In this day of destiny for us and for the world may we be worthy of our vocation as keepers of the sacred flame. Teach us so to live and so to toil and so to speak as we play our part, in this age on ages telling, that we may face with clear conscience the gaze of our contemporaries and the judgment of posterity. May our attitudes and hopes widen every area of good will within the reach of our influence. In these darkened days may our own spirits be as a beacon of hope amid the encircling gloom of despair. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 17, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 18, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen; and

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; and

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1227. An act for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

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

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

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been requested by the chairman of committee on committees of the minority, my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], to present an order which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. BENNETT be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

That Mr. MCCARTHY be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the action of the majority steering committee I send to the desk an order which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations as a member of the majority, and excused from further service as a member on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; and

That the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency as a member of the majority, and that he be also assigned to service on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the order?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the order. I ask that it be read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it again.

The order was again read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now understand the order. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, was consent given for a committee meeting?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Which one?

Mr. MCFARLAND. The Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHERRY. Will they continue to meet this afternoon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Consent has been given for the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations to meet this afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the committees will probably not remain in session later than 1 o'clock.

Mr. O'CONOR. It was the understanding, in making the request, that the session would not continue for any appreciable length of time. However, there was some very important information which had to be obtained in a very short time.