

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

E. Ross Jenney

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Charles E. Smith
Gert L. Laqueur
William J. Card

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Ralph J. Van Derwerker
Harry W. Poston

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

David E. Sutliff
Carl H. Brown
Bertram J. Baughman

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Margaret T. De Lawter

To be assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant)

Dade W. Moeller Roy O. McCaldin
Richard D. Coleman Charles V. Wright, Jr.
John V. Miner, Jr. Gordon E. Stone

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, who hast revealed Thyself as a presence to strengthen and a light to lead, may this new day be rich in the realization of Thy divine power and guidance.

Grant that we may be endowed with a faith which will make us victorious over all the dark and disquieting moods that frequently baffle and play such havoc with our souls.

May we have within our hearts that peace which is begotten of simple trust in Thee, and may we realize more fully that when we have Thee we have everything.

Fill us with an eager desire to know and do Thy will, and may we follow faithfully and courageously the ways of righteousness and justice which Thou hast marked out for us.

May we be united in the service of our beloved country, not merely striving to the utmost to dethrone and destroy the gods of war but seeking to build a nation that is spiritually minded lest the darkness of secularism and materialism and atheism descend upon us.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. JAMES A. VAN FLEET

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I note with pride and gratification the promotion of James A. Van Fleet, commander of the Eighth Army in Korea, to the rank of full general.

A distinguished son of Florida, General Van Fleet has done an outstanding job throughout his career. He has shown particular skill and ability in coping with Communist military tactics. In plainer words, he whipped them in Greece and he whipped them in Korea. His rank and stature have been earned the hard way.

He is clearly one of America's ablest present-day military leaders.

JOSEPH A. MYERS ET AL.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is now perfectly obvious that the Democratic Party has no genuine desire to curb inflation. The solid vote of the Democrats yesterday against a Republican proposal declaring as a matter of policy that the present authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board to exercise control on credit, bank deposits, and public financing concurrently with the direct controls of prices and wages makes it readily apparent that they intend to make a political issue of the distressing conditions caused by inflation. This is natural and understandable because it means thousands of jobs to their faithful followers and gives them an opportunity of paying lip service to the plight of the distressed consumers but it does not indicate a proper regard for the national welfare. Though understandable, it is unpardonable.

Certainly the existing laws with respect to indirect control of our credit and money supply were intended to be used and used effectively to control either inflation or deflation. The refusal by the Democrats to use these powers is unforgivable and shows their colors in striking contrast to the flag of genuine statesmanship. For 20 years Truman and his cohorts have fooled the American public. Certainly the country can

not withstand their mismanagement much longer. Complete socialism or bankruptcy, or both, is the inevitable result of the policies of the Democratic Party.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MAKING PEACE WITH GERMANY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the press a message, or a letter, has been sent by the President to the House and the Senate with reference to making peace with Germany. I should like to know if that message has been delivered to the House, or if it is available.

The SPEAKER. It has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

Mr. RANKIN. Has it been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

The SPEAKER. It has not.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include a resolution to declare the war at an end, a resolution I introduced on February 28 of this year.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 177

Joint resolution terminating the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan and between the United States and the Government of Germany

Resolved, etc., That the state of war declared to exist between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan by joint resolution of Congress approved December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 795), is hereby declared at an end.

SEC. 2. The state of war declared to exist between the United States and the Government of Germany by joint resolution of Congress approved December 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 796), is hereby declared at an end.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. When can we have an opportunity to vote on that proposition?

The SPEAKER. When it is reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RANKIN. Are we going to have to wait on them?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. That will probably be after the next war, I am afraid.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know anything about that.

Mr. RANKIN. If we should get into a war with Communist Russia we would need the help of the German people. The sooner we make peace with them the better it is going to be for us, as well as for them, and for our white Christian civilization as a whole.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE
JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL
YEAR 1952

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 685) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEFAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ARTHUR HENDRIK SORESENSEN, MAREN ANDERSON SORESENSEN, AND MINOR CHILD, EVELYN SORESENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 51) for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MRS. GEORGE (WONG TZE-YEN) POY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 124) for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy, who is the widow of a native-born citizen of the United States and the mother of seven children who are citizen residents of the United States, and who, but for the death of her husband, would be entitled to non-quota immigration status, shall, if otherwise found admissible to the United States, be deemed to be a returning resident under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended.

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.

RAFAEL KUBELIK, LUDMILA KUBELIK, AND MARTIN KUBELIK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 275) for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik.

XCVII—496

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

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.

SISTER BERTHA PFEIFFER AND SISTER ELZBIETA ZABINSKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 470) for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after "numbers", strike out "from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available" and insert "from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

CONRAD XAVIER CHARLES MAUERER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 631) for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Mauerer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Conrad Xavier Charles Mauerer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

LUIGI PODESTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 879) for the relief of Luigi Podesta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Luigi Podesta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

JAN JOSEF WIECKOWSKI AND FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1229) for the relief of Jan Josef Wieckowski and his wife and daughter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jan Josef Wieckowski, his wife, Irena, and daughter, Maria, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 11, after the words "to deduct", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "three numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

JAMES M. SHELLENBERGER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 699) for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor.

There being 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 the legal guardian of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor, of Mishawaka, Ind., the sum of \$50,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the injury of said James M. Shellenberger, Jr., which resulted in the permanent loss of sight in his left eye, the partial loss of sight in his right eye, and facial disfigurement, caused by the use of an improper solution of silver nitrate in the eyes of said infant at the time of his birth in the Sixty-first Station Hospital, United States Army.

at Leghorn, Italy, on January 8, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

HENDRYK KEMPSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 579) for the relief of Hendryk Kempinski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Hendryk Kempinski, who arrived at the port of New York, N. Y., June 4, 1949, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota for the first year that Polish quota numbers are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hendryk Kempinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KWANGNYENG CHU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of Kwangnyeng Chu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Kwangnyeng Chu, of Neptune, N. J., who entered the United States on a visitor's visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Kwang Myeng Chu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully

admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISABEL TABIT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 581) for the relief of Isabel Tabit.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Isabel Tabit, Montgomery, W. Va., who entered the United States on January 14, 1949, as a temporary visitor, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Lebanon for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Isabel Tabit shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. TJITSKE BANDSTRA VAN DER VELDE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 136), the alien Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde, whose husband, John Van Der Velde, and two children are residents and citizens of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence as a nonquota immigrant.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provision of the second category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Mrs. Tjitske Band-

stra Van Der Velde may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

RAMUTE ALEXANDRA VAILOKAITIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 677) for the relief of Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 14, 1949. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Lithuanian quota of the first year that the same Lithuanian quota is available.

Sec. 2. That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ANTON BERNHARD BLIKSTAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 870) for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Anton Bernhard Blikstad as of January 18, 1949, at New York, N. Y., the date and place he entered the United States legally as a visitor. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Spain for the first year that such quota is hereafter available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration

and naturalization laws, Anton Bernhard Bliksta, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ANTONIOS CHARALAMBOU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 970) to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. There is no reservation of objection on the Private Calendar. There must be an objection or a request to pass the bill over.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to make some inquiry about this.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman cannot do it. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Then I object to this bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are required.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. If we are going to tear down the immigration laws in this way, we ought to all be here to see it done.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must enforce the rules of the House.

The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. TRIMBLE. 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 Call No. 106]

Armstrong	Flood	Mumma
Beall	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Blatnik	Havener	O'Konski
Bosone	Hill	Powell
Boykin	Irving	Prouty
Breen	Jenkins	Sabath
Burdick	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer
Coudert	Latham	Sheppard
Curtis, Mo.	Lyle	Thompson,
Dawson	Mason	Mich.
Dingell	Mitchell	Woodruff
Dolliver	Morrison	
Durham	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PRIVATE CALENDAR

ANTONIOS CHARALAMBOU

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill

(H. R. 970) to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Antonios Charalambou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] to explain the measure. Let me say to the gentleman from Maryland that what I am trying to do is to prevent the gradual destruction of our immigration laws by piecemeal. The gentleman from Maryland is the author of this bill, and according to his explanation this bill would not have that effect. I would like for him to state to us just what it does.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charalambou is a native of Greece, born May 15, 1902, and since his fifteenth year has been a seaman. He sailed aboard American vessels continuously since August 1941 and up to his last discharge on October 13, 1950. In 1940, immediately prior to the commencement of his service aboard American ships, he was aboard two Greek merchant ships in American-European commerce which were torpedoed. In the summer of 1941 the alien made application for papers to ship aboard American ships, was accepted, and at once shipped out on the *Silver Sword* on August 30, 1941. He remained in constant service aboard the *Silver Sword* until this ship was torpedoed on September 20, 1942, while returning from a run to Archangel, U. S. S. R. He was rescued by an English ship in this convoy, which was in turn torpedoed, and then by a Dutch ship in the same convoy, also torpedoed. After several hours in the water he was again rescued and landed in England by a British destroyer. He returned to the United States as a rescued seaman aboard the *Queen Mary*, and by January 12, 1943, was again aboard an American merchant ship, the *Henry St. George Tucker*, on which he stayed to September 27, 1943. After more than 2 years steady service aboard American ships during the early war period, he became ill because of a stomach disorder, and was forced off the ships but for a period of less than 6 months, being all of the time under a doctor's care. He reported to the Immigration Service his disability and was permitted to remain in the United States under the care of his doctor.

Again, on March 17, 1944, he went back to sea aboard the American ship, *Conrad Weiser*, and remained on board until September 5, 1944, when his old disorder returned and forced him ashore, where he remained under care of a physician for almost a year, returning to the ships

aboard the ships *Lone Star*, August 5 to September 22, 1945; *Charles N. Coe*, November 7 to February 9, 1946; and *Walker D. Hines*, March 21 to October 11, 1946. It might be noted that during the alien's illnesses ashore, he did not take shore employment and kept the Immigration Service advised of his presence and the reason for his inability to ship.

The alien continued shipping American, and next remained aboard the *Park Benjamin* from December 16, 1946, to November 29, 1947, shipping on the *Wm. H. Aspinwall*, January 25 to March 22, 1948, on the *George Walton*, July 31 to September 10, 1948, and on the *Donald H. Holland*, December 29, 1948, to March 28, 1949.

After concluding service aboard the *Holland*, the alien learned that he was eligible to apply for American citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940. Having long had the desire to become an American citizen, the alien at once took the first step toward citizenship, filing the Form N-400 with the Immigration and Naturalization Service at New York in April 1949. While waiting to hear from the service, the alien did not wish to remain illegally in the United States and shipped again aboard an American ship, the *Pan Virginia*, July 13, 1949, but when this vessel was ordered into the coastwise service, the alien was forced to leave the ship because of regulations against aliens serving on coastwise vessels. Meanwhile, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, New York, addressed a letter to the alien on June 21, 1949, requesting him to come in to complete his application and, inferentially, to prepare his formal petition for citizenship. This letter was not forwarded to the alien from his New York address, the alien being then in Baltimore seeking a ship. Thereafter the alien, still awaiting further word on his application for citizenship, shipped on December 3, 1949, on the *Cygnets III*, and remained on board continuously until October 13, 1950, when the alien signed off at New York, and learned for the first time of the letter of June 21, 1949. It is of interest to note that the *Cygnets III* spent almost its entire cruise in far-eastern waters, returning to the United States twice to reload for brief periods at Mobile, Ala., and Gulfport, Miss.

At last receiving the long delayed letter of June 21, 1949, the alien went immediately to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and thereafter to your correspondent in an effort to move consideration of his long pending application to petition for citizenship. Meanwhile, as is well known to you, the Congress enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950, containing a provision, section 26, amending section 325 (a) of the 1940 Nationality Act so that only seamen who were permanent immigrants could thereafter count American ship service toward residence credit for naturalization. An exception was provided, but only for seamen who had filed their formal petitions for naturalization prior to enactment of the law, September 23, 1950. No provision was made for those who had filed the required form of application to petition for naturalization, and who

through circumstances beyond their control had not been able to complete formal filing before September 23, 1950.

In this case, the alien, with years of service, many under the most dangerous circumstances, was actually again serving in a danger area at a time when the law was passed depriving him of a privilege which he highly desired and for which he had taken the preliminary steps.

The alien presently resides in Baltimore, at 931 East Baltimore Street, and has at all times been a law-abiding person.

Mr. RANKIN. This measure designates this individual, does it?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. And it does not apply to anyone else?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is right. It is really a bill for the relief of Antonios Charalambou.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact this takes one number off the quota number, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. GARMATZ. That is right. The bill says that one number shall be deducted from the appropriate quota.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The effect of the enactment of this bill will be to substitute the name of this man for that of some other alien who is on the quota list, but whose name has not been reached.

Mr. GARMATZ. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. It is limited to one individual? That does not show in the record here, and that is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. GARMATZ. The bill states on line 9 of page 1 that the "Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Antonios Charalambou."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER NATALIE AND SISTER ALICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1136) for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi), who arrived at the port of New York, February 7, 1950, and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta), who arrived at the port of San Francisco, Calif., October 13, 1949, shall, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax, be considered for the purpose of immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota

control officer to deduct two numbers from the quota of Hungary, for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. EUGEN JOSE SINGER AND MRS. FRIEDA SINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1420) for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the cases of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and the said Mrs. Frieda Singer shall not be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants or orders have been issued.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and the said Mrs. Frieda Singer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 3 through 12.

On page 2, line 1, strike out the words "SEC. 2."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

SISTER M. CROCEFISSA AND SISTER M. REGINALDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2158) for the relief of Sister M. Crocefissa and Sister M. Reginalda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Crocefissa (Maria Pozzobon) and Sister M. Reginalda (Giovannina Gemin), who were admitted to the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the dates of their last entries, on payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Crocefissa (Maria Pozzobon) and Sister M. Reginalda (Giovannina Gemin) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTER M. LEONIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of Sister M. Leonida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Leonida (Zanka Gotcheva), who was admitted to the United States on a temporary visa, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry, on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Leonida (Zanka Gotcheva) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JAI YOUNG LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2292) for the relief of Jai Young Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Jai Young Lee, the Korean stepchild of an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be granted admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", insert "Frank Lee."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "War", strike out the balance of line 7, all of lines 8 and 9 and down to and including the word "residence" in line 10, and insert "II. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Jai Young Lee shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Frank Lee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

THOMAS ALVA RAPHAEL (RICHARDS)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2787) for the relief of Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards), Japanese minor child in the care of Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Thomas G. Richards. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Thomas G. Richards.

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

IRENE SENUTOVITCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of Irene Senutovitch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Irene Senutovitch, who entered the United States as a temporary visitor, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to make the appropriate quota deduction with respect to such alien.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Senutovitch", strike out the balance of line 4, all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, and down to and including the word "alien" in line 10, and insert "shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such

alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ANN ELISABETH (DIANA ELIZABETH) REINGRUBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3819) for the relief of Ann Elisabeth (Diana Elizabeth) Reingruber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Ann Elisabeth (Diana Elizabeth) Reingruber, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Capt. and Mrs. Billy J. Munnerlyn, citizens of the United States.

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

SHOZO ICHIWAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of Shozo Ichiwawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Shozo Ichiwawa, Japanese minor child in the care of Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Robert Yung. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Shozo Ichiwawa shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of said Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Robert Yung.

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

DR. GEORGE ALEXANDROS CHRONAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4038) for the relief of Dr. George Alexandros Chronakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. George Alexandros Chronakis, of Knoxville, Tenn., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the next business (H. Con. Res. 111) granting permanent residence to certain aliens.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CARROLL O. SWITZER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 623) for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, notwithstanding section 1204 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, or any other provision of law, there shall be paid, out of any appropriation available for payment of salaries of judges of the district courts of the United States, to Carroll O. Switzer a sum representing the salary of a judge of a district court of the United States for the period which the said Carroll O. Switzer served as district judge for the southern district of Iowa after August 9, 1950.

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

MAJ. BRUCE B. CALKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 828) for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Bruce B. Calkins, Air Force Reserve, AO 335-054, the sum of \$962. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Maj. Bruce B. Calkins against the United States arising when, as a result of a temporary change in Army regulations, he was deprived of terminal leave to which he would otherwise have been entitled: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$962" and insert "\$475.78."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

R. E. AGEE AND MARGARET E. AGEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee, Orland, Calif., the sum of \$28,749.42. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee against

the United States arising out of the destruction and depreciation of their livestock, improvements, and equipment on San Nicolas Island, Calif., as the result of Government construction of military installations on the island during 1942 and 1943 and Government termination, on March 19, 1943, of the revocable permit under which they had occupied the island for grazing purposes since June 11, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$28,749.42" and insert "\$7,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JAMES J. LIEBERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1688) for the relief of James J. Lieberman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James J. Lieberman, Detroit, Mich., the sum of \$1,700. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James J. Lieberman against the United States arising out of a collision on June 19, 1948, at Giessen, Germany, between his automobile and an Army vehicle driven by a member of the United States Army. At the time of the collision, which was caused by the negligence of the driver of the Army vehicle, Mr. Lieberman was driving his automobile in line of duty as a member of the United States Army. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUY CHRISTIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1961) for the relief of Guy Christian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Guy Christian (formerly known as McVea J. Vigouroux, staff sergeant, 14026146, AC), San Jose, Calif., the sum of \$450. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Guy Christian against the United States for reimbursement of expenses necessarily incurred by him in evading capture by the enemy, and ultimately returning to the

military control of the United States, while serving in guerrilla bands in the Philippine Islands during the Japanese occupation of such islands in World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. ALFRED PULLIAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2275) for the relief of J. Alfred Pulliam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Alfred Pulliam, of Waukegan, Ill., the sum of \$20,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, on December 22, 1944, at Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of any services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

OLLIE O. EVANS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2459) for the relief of Ollie O. Evans, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765-769), are hereby waived in favor of Ollie O. Evans, Jr., for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps, in Jones County, Miss., in 1936, is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Federal Security Agency (Bureau of Employees' Com-

pensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Federal Security Agency" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of Labor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

THOMAS G. DIGGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2550) for the relief of Thomas G. Digges.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of funds of the District of Columbia, to Thomas G. Digges, Arlington, Va., the sum of \$96. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Thomas G. Digges against the District of Columbia for refund of the amount of the nonresident tuition fee which he paid on September 1, 1949, to the District of Columbia for the attendance of his son, Robert H. Digges, at Gordon Junior High School for the first semester of the 1949-50 school year. The said Robert H. Digges attended such school for only 1 day, September 13, 1949, before withdrawing to attend school in Virginia but refund of such fee by the District of Columbia is not authorized because payment thereof was legally and properly made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELWOOD GRISSINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3730) for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay and deliver to the estate of the late Elwood Grissinger, of Buffalo, N. Y., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States, on account of the use outside of the United States of certain long-distance telephone patents, inventions, and devices of the said Grissinger by the American Expeditionary Forces during the World War and the subsequent sale thereof, such amounts of bonds which the United States received from the Republic of France and other foreign countries, through the United States Liquidating Commission, as the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, finds to be equitable compensation as a result of such use and sale. The Court of Claims is hereby authorized and directed to render to the Secretary of Defense its opinion as to any matter as to which he requests to be advised, but such opinion, if any be

requested and rendered, shall not limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to determine suitable compensation hereunder.

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

WILLIAM C. REED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2858) for the relief of William C. Reed.

There being 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 William C. Reed, of Pasadena, Calif., the sum of \$5,710.20 for the damages caused to his property located in Riverside County, Calif., on September 21, 1943, as the result of noncombat activities of the United States Army: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF NORA B. KENNEDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of the estate of Nora B. Kennedy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Nora B. Kennedy, late of South Boston, Mass., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States arising out of the death of the said Nora B. Kennedy, which occurred as a result of her being struck by a United States Army vehicle on December 31, 1944, while she was crossing D Street near the intersection of Third Street in South Boston: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of" strike out everything up to the colon on page 2, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$5,000, and to pay Mrs. Ann R. Norton the sum of \$1,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Nora B. Kennedy, deceased, and for personal injuries and expenses incident thereto sustained by Mrs. Ann R. Norton which occurred as a result of an accident during which they were struck by a United States Army vehicle on December 31, 1944, while they were crossing D Street near the intersection of Third Street in South Boston, Mass."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Nora B. Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs. Ann R. Norton."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL D. BANNING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3891) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1438, for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, be substituted for the House bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,625.40 of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of \$1,641.41 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, not to exceed the sum of \$207.63 shall be credited in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; and not to exceed the sum of \$416.31 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, such credits being allowed to adjust certain overdrafts in such accounts; and (b) not to exceed the stated sums shall be paid to the following-named employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in reimbursement for amounts paid by them from their personal funds on account of counterfeited bills and notes accepted by them while in the discharge of their official duties: J. W. Bell; Florence Brown; Rosamond H. Cross; Charles F. DeLisle; William H. Franz; Edward N. Fuller; Raymond C. Hein; Estelle V. Laisch; Mrs. Mae Mohn; Mrs. Charlotte Parmentier; Carolyn E. Phipps; Arthur T. Schroeder; Joseph F. Schuler; Margaret T. Sennott; Florence Stetter; Lenora Willsey, \$10 each; F. H. Bowden, Jr.; Gertrude J. Davis; Mary S. Donovan; Helen Keegan; Arthur J. Loucks; Helen M. Pletzcker; Dorothy Baron Rich; J. L. Schrum, \$20 each; and Harriet Ann Duke, \$40.

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

GEORGE S. PASCHKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3966) for the relief of George S. Paschke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George S. Paschke, of Bremerton, Wash., the sum of \$1,668.34. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George S. Paschke against the United States

for loss of wages, crops, and personal property, and for medical expenses, resulting from his wrongful imprisonment by the United States Army from May 23, 1946, to June 7, 1946: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER M. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4226) for the relief of Walter M. Smith.

There being 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, the sum of \$112.15 to Walter M. Smith, of 72 Chittenden Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for expenses incurred in travel from Columbus, Ohio, to Riverton, Wyo., and return, on instructions from Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in the month of June 1948: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAUD M. WRIGHT AND MRS. MAXINE ROBERTS, FORMERLY MRS. MAXINE MILLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4246) for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Maud M. Wright, Robinson, Ill., the sum of \$7,500, and to Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills, Robinson, Ill., the sum of \$7,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Mrs. Maud M. Wright for the death of her husband, Orin C. Wright, on January 21, 1944, and of the said Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills, for the death of her former husband, Charles W. Mills, on January 22, 1944, both of whom died as the result of burns sustained in a fire at the Evans Hall housing project, Evansville, Ind., which was under the supervision and management of the National Housing Agency, the United States Court of Claims (Cong. No. 17850, decided March 6, 1951, pursuant to S. Res. 227, 80th Cong.) having found that the United States was negligent in failing to

enforce its safety regulations, and that such failure was the proximate cause of the deaths: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out \$7,500" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

JOHN S. DOWNING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of John S. Downing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John S. Downing, of Fayetteville, N. C., the sum of \$327.75. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John S. Downing against the United States for compensation for services performed between March 26, 1949, and May 12, 1949 (both dates inclusive, as United States Commissioner for the eastern district of North Carolina: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEFAN LENARTOWICZ AND HIS WIFE, IRENE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 360) for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "proper", strike out the balance of the line, all of line

11 and line 1 on page 2 and insert the following: "quota officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

SUI KEN FONG AND SUI TUNG FONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 417) for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children, Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Soo Wing Fong, a citizen of the United States.

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.

BETTY MINORU KAWACHI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 915) for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Betty Minoru Kawachi, the minor child of Mrs. James J. Leatherman, a citizen of the United States.

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.

ESTATE OF SIDNEY LOMAX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 536) for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased, the sum of \$5,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Sidney Lomax, who died as a result of injuries received when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Starkville, Miss., on November 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

GRADY FRANKLIN WELCH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Grady Franklin Welch, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$450, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for attorney's fees paid by him, the said Welch, to his attorney of record in the case of United States against Welch, criminal number 10200, District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk Division: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

PHILIP J. HINCKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1113) for the relief of Philip J. Hincks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Philip J. Hincks, of Middlebury, Vt., the sum of \$150. The payment of such sum shall be in full payment of all claims of the said Philip J. Hincks against the United States for reimbursement of money paid for uniforms which were required during his training as a midshipman at the United States Naval Reserve Midshipman's School, Chicago, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

ROY F. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 796) for the relief of Roy F. Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roy F. Wilson, of Burlington, Iowa, the sum of \$336.17, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for travel allowance from Paris, France, to Burlington, Iowa, incident to his discharge from the Army of the United States on November 23, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$336.17" and insert "\$330.25."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSEPH A. FERRARI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3026) for the relief of Joseph A. Ferrari.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Ferrari, Dorchester, Mass., the sum of \$368.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Joseph A. Ferrari for reimbursement for personal property which he lost when the steamship *Antoine Saugrain* was sunk by enemy action on December 5, 1944, while transporting the said Joseph A. Ferrari and other members of the Armed Forces from Hollandia, New Guinea, to Leyte, Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$368.50" and insert "\$333.75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

VINCENT F. LESLIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4456) for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie.

There being 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 Vincent F. Leslie, Washington, D. C., the sum of \$2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Vincent F. Leslie on account of his arrest and imprisonment at Jacksonville, Fla., by and at the request of United States Post Office Department inspectors on July 3, 1926, and again on July 8, 1926, and his ensuing confinement in jail until the dismissal of the prosecution against him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIYOKO MATSUO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 608) for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not apply to Kiyoko Matsuo, Japanese fiancée of Martin Boyer, Lancaster, Ohio, a United States citizen. The said Kiyoko Matsuo shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that she is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of marrying the said Martin Boyer and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If such marriage does not occur within 3 months after her entry, the said Kiyoko Matsuo shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported under sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., secs. 155 and 156). If such marriage occurs within 3 months after her entry, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission of the said Kiyoko Matsuo to the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of her entry, upon payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

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

MRS. SHIZUKO YAMANE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs. Shizuko Yamane, Japanese wife of Kanichi John Yamane, a citizen of the United States, and the mother of three United States citizen children, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of the said Mrs. Shizuko Yamane to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Mrs. Shizuko Yamane, the wife of Kanichi John Yamane, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WLADIMIR PETER LEWICKI ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki (his wife), and George Wladimir Lewicki (their son), who entered the United States for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of visa fees and head taxes. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to make appropriate deductions from the immigration quota or quotas to which such aliens are properly chargeable.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WILLEM SMITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 982) for the relief of Willem Smits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Willem Smits shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of November 30, 1947, the date of his last entry into the United States.

Sec. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Holland.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Willem Smits shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one

number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GEORGE CRISAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of George Crisan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of George Crisan as of September 17, 1949, the date he lawfully entered the United States, upon the payment by him of the required visa fee and head taxes.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Rumania of the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, George Crisan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

HANOI SARAPANOVSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1598) for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Hanoh Sarapanovski as of April 4, 1950, the date on which he entered the United States at San Antonio, Tex., upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hanoh Sarapanovski, also known as Hanoh Charat, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to

Hanoh Sarapanovski the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

"SEC. 2. That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovski (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovski (also known as Hanoh Charat), Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovski (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovski."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSHI KAZUO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1920) for the relief of Hoshi Kazuo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Hoshi Kazuo, half-Japanese minor child in the care of Sgt. John B. Humbert and Mrs. Thelma Humbert, citizens of the United States. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Hoshi Kazuo shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Sgt. John B. Humbert and the said Mrs. Thelma Humbert.

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

MARIANNE AND MICHEL SPEELMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2498) for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marianne and Michel Speelman, of New York, N. Y., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "visa fee and head tax" and insert "visa fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA THERESA STANCOLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2514) for the relief of Maria Theresa Stancola.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Maria Theresa Stancola, German wife of Joseph J. Stancola, a United States citizen serving in the United States Armed Forces, with respect to any conviction or admission of the commission of any crime in her case of which the Department of State and the Department of Justice have knowledge on the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Maria Theresa Stancola may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

HELEN J. LUMLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2774) for the relief of Helen J. Lumley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Helen J. Lumley shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Helen J. Lumley and her daughter, Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JANE AND MARTHA CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. H. 3151) for the relief of Jane and Martha Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor children, Jane and Martha Clark, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Eric B. Clark, a citizen of the United States.

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

ETHEL CRISTETA BERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3895) for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ethel Cristeta Berner who entered the United States on September 21, 1945, at San Francisco, Calif., and who currently is in a non-quota status as a student, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Philippine Islands for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ethel Cristeta Berner shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS
OF 1951

Mr. SPENCE. 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. 3871) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, 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. 3871, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 21 on page 2 of the bill.

If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 2 immediately following line 21, title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding the following section:

"Sec. 104. That import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. ALBERT. I want to congratulate my colleague of the Committee on Agriculture for this amendment. I have an identical amendment at the desk, and I hope the amendments prevail.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a vital and necessary amendment to the security and economy of the United States. It simply authorizes the continuance of the present import controls of fats and oils. The amendment also includes cheese and other dairy products which are vital to our economy and for which increased domestic production is needed.

House Resolution 278, which was approved by both Houses of Congress on June 30, continue title II of the Second War Powers Act which authorized import controls on fats and oils and butter. Therefore, these controls are extended in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of July. If that action had not been taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency as well as the House and the other body, then the law would have expired on June 30. This would have permitted large imports of fats and oils and butter upon our domestic market to the detriment of American production.

Mr. Chairman, it is very vital to the economy of our country to encourage

abundant domestic production of fats and oils and dairy products during the present emergency. If we do not continue these powers of control over imports of these commodities, it is quite apparent that we will have a flood of fats and oils and dairy products on our domestic market coming from other countries and produced at a much lower cost than what we produce them for here in the United States.

I feel that it is vital to the security and economy of the United States to secure abundant production of fats and oils and dairy products by American farmers. This production should be encouraged by Congress and the Government, and my amendment proposes to give such encouragement.

There has been an embargo on imports of foreign butter for several years under authority of the Second War Powers Act, which law has been continued by Congress on several occasions. This law expired on June 30, but was continued for the month of July by Congress with the approval of the President.

The tariff duty on butter was reduced by the President from 14 cents to 7 cents per pound in 1949. A quota of butter imports under the reduced duty was placed at 60,000,000 pounds. This was an invitation to foreign producers of butter to ship their products to the United States. Foreign-produced butter can be laid down in our principal consuming markets, with duty and transportation paid, at from 43 cents to 55 cents per pound. The support price on butter fixed by the Department of Agriculture is 66 cents per pound. Up to the present time, the embargo on butter imports has protected domestic producers. If the embargo is not continued as proposed in my amendment, our country will be flooded with foreign butter imports, and the Department of Agriculture will be required to buy at least 100,000,000 pounds of domestic butter under the support program. This would result in another potato fiasco. The people will remember that 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes from Canada came into the United States at a price a few cents under the support price, while we were destroying potatoes produced in the United States. We do not want to go through a similar experience with butter, cheese, and other dairy products, or with fats and oils.

During the past 5 years dairy cow population has decreased around 3,000,000 head. The population of human beings in the United States has increased by more than 10,000,000 during the same period. We should have more dairy cows instead of less to provide the American people with more milk at cheaper prices. My amendment seeks to give this encouragement to American dairy farmers for the next 2 years by placing an embargo on imports of butter, cheese, and other dairy products. Unless favorable action is taken here today, and should the farmers be compelled to face foreign competition from imports many of them will sell their dairy cows for slaughter which will mean a further reduction in the supply of milk, cheese, and other dairy products for American consumers.

I have included cheese and other dairy products in my amendment. These dairy products are definitely tied into butter, and should have the same protection as to imports. Around 50,000,000 pounds of foreign-made cheese was brought into this country in 1950.

There are many kinds of cheese which have been imported from foreign countries. I want to illustrate what has happened in the case of blue—bleu—cheese. Imports of this cheese in 1950 amounted to 3,491,837 pounds. This type of foreign cheese is being sold today in the New York market at a wholesale price from 39 cents to 43 cents per pound. There are 22 American producers of blue cheese. Under prevailing milk prices it costs the American producers at least 50 cents per pound to produce blue cheese. American producers of this type of cheese cannot long survive if they are forced to meet this foreign competition. It is the intention of my amendment to place an embargo against importation of blue cheese, or any other type of cheese that is presently injuring domestic production. It is also the intention of my amendment to continue the embargo against butter imports and the other commodities or products set forth in the amendment.

The embargo as defined in the amendment will be automatic and go into operation in accordance with the three standards set forth in my proposal to the Committee of the Whole. The amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 104. That import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program.

The Senate of the United States has adopted the language of this amendment which is found in S. 1717, an act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and so forth.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the gentleman's amendment only seek to carry out the present law? Is it different from the present law?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is somewhat different from the present law because we have spelled out in the amendment certain commodities.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I wish the gentleman would discuss that feature of his amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment provides a certain yardstick that will govern the embargo provisions of this bill. In the first place, no imports of fats and oils and butter, cheese, and other dairy products will be permitted to come into this country for the next 2 years, provided (a) if such imports will impair or reduce the domestic production of any commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in view of the domestic and international conditions; or, (b) if it interferes with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of such commodities; or, (c) if it results in any unnecessary burden or expenditure under any Government support program.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's amendment is not confined to dairy products, is it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is confined to all fats and oils. I will read the items in there. Import controls of fats and oils include oil-bearing material, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder—but excluding petroleum and petroleum products, coconuts, and coconut products—peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, rice and rice products. Those are the items covered.

Mr. COOLEY. Would it not be interesting to know why the committee left this provision out of this bill, since a similar provision has been in the law for quite some time?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, it was not in the Defense Production Act of 1950. The authority for an embargo on fats, oils, and butter was contained in the Second War Powers Act which has been continued several times under legislation from the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. When did that expire?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That expired on June 30, but was continued under House Resolution 278 for another month.

Mr. COOLEY. And but for the continuing resolution, it would have already expired?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would have already expired and those commodities would have been dumped on our market.

I introduced a bill having somewhat the same language and the same intent, on June 5, H. R. 4335, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wrote the chairman of the committee asking for a hearing, but up to the present time a hearing has not been granted. I can readily understand that, because the committee has been so busy.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman certainly did not understand I was criticizing the committee. I merely asked

him if it would not be interesting to know why the committee did not put provisions of this kind in the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sure that we do not intend to criticize the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any such provision in the bill as presented by the committee?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no such provision.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We did not have any jurisdiction of the subject matter at all. We never did have. We extended it for 30 days so we could look into it. It is not in this bill because it is not the proper place for it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When I introduced my bill on June 5, it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I asked for a hearing on it.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. I think one other thing should be pointed out. Some of these commodities are under price supports and acreage quotas, and if a flood of imports comes in at this time the Commodity Credit Corporation's good record for the last year will be in reverse in a few days.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to elaborate on that for just a moment, because that is very vital and that is included in the amendment. In the case of butter, butter from New Zealand can be laid down in the United States at 43 cents a pound, duty and transportation paid. The support price is 66 cents a pound.

A few hundred thousand pounds of butter can break the market. The wholesale market now is about 68 cents, and with the support price at 66 this foreign butter flooding our market will cause the Department of Agriculture to buy probably 150,000,000 pounds of domestic butter at the support price.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. COOLEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he referred his bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that it is currently being considered.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. Under the present law the President has control of the importation of fats and oils. The gentleman's amendment makes some material

changes in the present law. That is true, is it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. That is correct. I am sure the committee will be perfectly glad to have a hearing on this proposition and consider reporting a bill. But here comes an amendment; we have had no opportunity to study it. The first time I saw it was a few minutes ago. I think the gentleman ought to give us an opportunity to study the facts; and I want to say to the gentleman that I do not think it will take more than a day; that we will consider this proposition and give him a hearing on his bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the chairman for that statement, but this is a matter of emergency. If this amendment is not passed in this bill by the end of this month our country is going to be flooded with butter and fats and oils from other countries in the world under a reduced tariff and there is only one concern in the United States who will profit by it; that is the Uni-Lever Bros., who control fats and oils throughout the world. Uni-Lever has a virtual monopoly on fats and oils supplies throughout the entire world, and we certainly do not want all of those competitive products dumped upon our market in the United States to the detriment of American producers. It will react against our entire economy.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. LARCADE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether rice and rice products are included.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Rice and rice products are included in the bill.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. ABBITT. Is not the gentleman's amendment word for word like the amendment adopted by the other body when it passed the act week before last?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, this amendment, word for word, was adopted by the other body and there apparently was not much of any opposition to it because I assume that they were also interested in protecting the domestic producers in a long-range program.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. BROOKS. Does the gentleman's amendment cover vegetable oils generally?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It covers all fats and oils; and with a large cotton crop staring us in the face, probably 16,000,000 to 19,000,000 bales you are going to have so much cottonseed oil that certainly it must be protected from imports. That also is true for soybeans and soybean oil and other fats which the Department of Agriculture is urging be produced in this country. If we do not want the Government to buy these products under the support program at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, then we had better pass my amendment so we can protect not only the Treasury of the United States but also the economy of the country.

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to extend the present law. If we can get a commitment from the chairman to have hearings on it then I think that probably will be the better way to do it, but I realize we have got to have something within 30 days, but to have a separate law is a better way to do it. I do not understand the difference between the gentleman's amendment and present law, but I think something ought to be done along this line.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we do not do it now it will be too late to enact another law and have it passed by both bodies before the end of this month; and we certainly do not want our country to be used as a dumping ground for fats and oils and dairy products.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. What effect would the gentleman's amendment have on butter price to consumers?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It will protect the consumers and assure them of an adequate supply of butter and other dairy products produced in our country. Since 45 percent of our meat comes from American dairy farms, meat supplies will be increased for the consumers. It is profitable for a dairy farmer to sell his dairy cattle today for beef and that is what a lot of them are doing. That is why we have lost over 3,000,000 head. If you want to look forward a year or two from now, we better have more milk cows and protect the economy of the dairy farmers who are producing the milk, butter, and other dairy products for American consumers. The best insurance for American consumers against price increases will be to encourage more production of dairy products in the United States.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, let us give him more protection than he gets now under the parity price program?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, this gives him protection from the imports that come in under a reduced duty, and under devalued foreign money.

Mr. JAVITS. It will give him more production than he has under the present price support program?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we do not, we will have another potato fiasco here in the United States, with hundreds of millions of pounds of fats and oils and dairy products being imported into the country, and with our

Government buying it under the price-support program to hold up the price, simply providing a market for foreign production.

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. When was the last time any of these products the gentleman seeks to place an embargo upon, these edible products, were imported into this country?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This embargo has been in operation for several years under the Second War Powers Act, which expired on June 30, but was continued for 30 days in the recent resolution we passed.

Mr. MULTER. As I understand it, the gentleman has no fault to find with the laws as they exist today?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; certainly not; but there is a question whether or not it can be administered and interpreted as a continuing proposition under the Second War Powers Act, for butter and the other products in the amendment.

Mr. MULTER. Does it not accomplish the gentleman's purpose if the present law is simply extended? In other words, we simply extend the existing law for the duration of this act?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No.

Mr. MULTER. Then we will give the gentleman a hearing on his bill and determine what changes, if any, should be made?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will not accomplish the purpose that I seek, because the administration has decided that under the powers in the Defense Production Act they are not broad enough to take in and protect these various fats and oils and dairy products.

Mr. MULTER. I suggest we extend the existing law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will not do the job.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I have an identical amendment at the Clerk's desk. The control of imports of the type contemplated by this amendment is essential to protect the farmers and taxpayers of this country. Importations of fats and oils, including dairy products and peanuts, would seriously jeopardize the price-support program on such products. In order to maintain their prices, peanut farmers of this country have consented to the reduction of their acreage over the years. If foreign peanuts were allowed to be shipped into this country, it would mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation would probably have to buy the entire American crop. The effect of this would be disastrous for two reasons. In the first place, it would

cost the taxpayer enormous sums of money, and in the second place, its ultimate effect would be to destroy the price-support program on American produced peanuts. As a matter of fact it would probably ultimately result in bankrupting farmers who depend upon peanuts as a cash crop.

I congratulate the gentleman upon his amendment and sincerely hope that it prevails.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky whether or not he withdraws his point of order against the amendment?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted. It must be perfectly obvious to all of us that separate legislation will not be enacted within the next 2 or 3 weeks and if this amendment is not adopted the law will expire and our country could be flooded with imported fats and oils.

Even while the law was in effect and embargoes were in operation, I received information to the effect that consideration was being given to the advisability of lifting the embargoes so as to permit the importation of peanuts in large quantities from Red China. This was about a year ago and upon receiving the information, I came straight to Washington where some of my colleagues met me, and we discussed the matter at great length with officials in the executive branch. We emphasized the fact that the peanut producers of our country had accepted acreage allotment and marketing quotas and had embarked upon a program which contemplated a drastic reduction in the production of peanuts. We also pointed out that our Government at that time was supporting the price of peanuts and that the Government had millions and millions of dollars invested in peanuts which had been acquired under the support program. Just how ridiculous can we be? If we are going to support the price of peanuts in this country and sustain substantial losses, how can we justify permitting the importation of large quantities of peanuts from places across the sea?

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. If this amendment is not enacted, it is entirely probable that the Commodity Credit Corporation, with taxpayers' funds, will buy the entire American peanut crop and a substantial portion of all butter and milk products produced in this country.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. I know that about a year ago we were told that there were shiploads of peanuts ready to be dumped on the market in America, and but for the fact that the embargo was not lifted, those peanuts would have come in. How do we know that tomorrow morning, or rather, at the expiration of this law, that ships might not be in our ports ready to unload large quantities of fats and oils to further depress the American market?

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

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

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that while this embargo has been in effect that no imports of butter has come in, and the Commodity Credit Corporation did buy large quantities of domestic butter?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, under the support program, perhaps that is true. We probably will be buying peanuts, but why should we lift the embargo and flood our market with foreign oils and fats and still continue the support program?

Mr. MULTER. We are not suggesting that we lift the embargo, but the question in my mind is, How can you possibly be hurt if the existing embargo law stands, until we can have a hearing on the bill to determine whether changes in the bill should be enacted? That is the point.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, the author of the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The solicitor for the Department of Agriculture has stated that the existing law will only apply to linseed oil and rice. Those are the only two commodities to which he can make it applicable. And, I might say further, that on June 30, before this continuing act was passed, the Department had prepared an order putting the existing law as provided in the Defense Production Act into operation covering only imports on linseed oil and rice.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, permit me to read from the law. With all due deference to the gentleman, he just cannot read what it says when he gives you the opinion he quoted: Fats, edible oils, including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconut products.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. That is the law the gentleman wants to extend.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And rice and rice products. They have ruled down in the Department that they must come in under the Defense Production Act and not under the War Powers Act, and under either act they have ruled that it was not particularly in the interest of defense production for them to include other fats and oils and butter. Now, they were before our committee, and that was the ruling their counsel made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the law that I am talking about that we are suggesting should be extended is the same

law that we extended a few days ago when we included rent control in the Defense Production Act, and specifically this very Fats and Oil Embargo Act we are talking about is chapter 426 of Public Law 591.

Mr. COOLEY. How long was it extended?

Mr. MULTER. Until the end of this month.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and the gentleman knows full well that if we do not take action here and now it will never be extended past the first of August, and on the second of August our market could very well be flooded.

Mr. MULTER. I agree with that, but let us extend this law as it is now, and then decide what changes, if any, must be made in this law.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, as I understand it, the gentleman is willing to accept an extending amendment, an amendment the effect of which would be to extend existing law.

Mr. MULTER. Exactly.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Minnesota should be able to discuss that more intelligently than I could, because he knows the real difference between his amendment and existing law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, of course I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have already stated the attitude of the Department of Agriculture and their counsel on this matter, so that either under the Second War Powers Act, to which the gentleman has referred, or under any provision of the Defense Production Act, they say it will not be made applicable to anything but linseed oil and rice. That is all that is necessary, because it is all in the interest of defense production and the security of the country. I have tied into mine the economy of the country. I do not know, and I have no way to determine, how the administrators or the lawyers down in the administration are going to act, so I do not think the gentleman and I can say here how they will interpret a law, but I do know that they came before our Committee on Agriculture and stated that, and they threw out dairy products and they threw out the other fats and oils. So this amendment was perfected, and they saw it, and they agreed that this would accomplish the result for which I have offered it, and it has been adopted in the Senate.

Mr. MULTER. My suggestion is, let us extend the existing law and either the gentleman's Committee on Agriculture or the Committee on Banking and Currency can consider it and hold hearings. Our chairman says it should not take more than a day. Then we can find out what changes you need, if you need any.

Mr. COOLEY. The situation is that we must act now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Andresen amendment, for what I consider very good and sufficient reasons.

This Nation produces annually around 10,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils. Because of that great production we have had in this Nation more fats and oils than the American people could consume. Because of that the price of lard has been about 50 percent of the

should have been over the period of the past 4 or 5 years.

When a packer buys a hog, he knows before he even buys the hog that he is going to lose on the lard, so he must raise the price of pork chops in order to make up that difference. So when people buy the pork chops, they must pay a higher price than they would pay if lard was at its proper price level.

Here are some more facts the Members from the large industrial centers should take into consideration before they vote on this amendment. Labor draws in wages a little over \$4 for every dollar the farmer takes in. Industry sells on an average a little over \$4 worth of goods for every dollar the farmer takes in. So when you reduce the farm income you reduce by at least fourfold the amount that labor will draw in wages, and by over fourfold the amount the business man will sell in goods. So it affects the whole economy of the Nation.

Every raw product comes from the soil or the seed.

Seventy percent of the working people of America are employed in some phase of growing, transporting, processing and wholesaling and retailing farm products.

If the farmer does not get sufficient pay for those products, every man, woman and child in America suffers. It must also be remembered that since we mechanized our farms over the past 25 years, the national income averages almost exactly seven times our farm income. So it is not only for the benefit of the farmer that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has offered his amendment, but it is for the benefit of every American.

I hope that the Representatives from the industrial sections of the country will recognize these facts and that farming is the basic industry of the country. We have always had a depression in this Nation when farm prices were too low, and we have always had prosperous times when farm prices were at fairly high level as is the case today and when we argue that we should have beef roll-backs, for instance, we must realize that those roll-backs will cost the American farmer many hundreds of millions of dollars and in turn they will cost the laboring man and industry fourfold more than the farmer will suffer as a result of such roll-backs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I think this amendment is serious enough to justify a great deal of thought and consideration. I come from a cotton-producing State. Our section depends upon cotton. Last year we had a very great shortage of cotton. The Department of Agriculture appealed to our people to plant more cotton, a great deal more cotton and to try for an all-time record in cotton production. Our farmers have gone to work this year and are producing an all-time record in the production of cotton in the South and West.

Last night I read in the paper and then again this morning I read the

articles in the paper in reference to the agricultural report on the production of cotton. I find that the cotton acreage is up 58 percent in the United States over what it was a year ago. Our farmers are planting 11,000,000 more acres of cotton this year throughout the South and West than they did the year before. The three Western States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico alone have planted an all-time record acreage in cotton, about 40 percent above the previous record year of 1949. None of us were greatly surprised last night to read the report from the Department of Agriculture showing an estimate of 17,000,000 bales of American cotton to be produced during the coming year. That is what they estimate, and I think it is a conservative estimate.

We find as a result of it that yesterday afternoon the cotton market fell \$3.10 a bale on cotton. I think that is something we ought to think about. I am not alarmed. But if cotton produces cottonseed, and from cottonseed comes cottonseed meal and oil, we should have in force a law which will permit our Government to restrict the importation of vegetable oils in competition with cottonseed oil. If there is any doubt at all about the authority, I am in favor of extending that authority. So I am in support of the amendment presently before the committee or some other amendment which will accomplish this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE:

"SEC. 104. The act of June 30, 1950, Public Law 590, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'July 31, 1951,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'September 30, 1952'."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I think the present law has served every purpose for which it was enacted. It has protected every agricultural product that was sought to be protected.

I might say that includes peanuts. The growers of peanuts are much exercised that the law would expire and they would have no protection.

That law was considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is within the jurisdiction of that committee, and that committee reported it after hearings. I realize that the farmer needs protection. While I live in an industrial section, seven of the counties I represent are as much devoted to agriculture as any county in the United States. I want to protect the farmers. I know that farming is the great basic industry of America. I know that when the farmer is not prosperous none of us is prosperous. I want to see the farmer protected. I want him to obtain the fruits of his labor. But why should we adopt an amendment, when we have had no opportunity to consider it? I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota will admit it changes the basic policy. It is a far-reaching amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Not right now. It is a far-reaching amendment. We have had no opportunity to give it consideration. I had never seen it until a few minutes ago. The Senate may have adopted it, but is that any precedent for the House? I think not. If you adopt it, there will be no chance for any consultation in conference in regard to it, because I understand it is in the words of the Senate bill.

Now, why not give the Committee on Banking and Currency an opportunity to consider this matter? Why not give them an opportunity to hear witnesses on the subject, to see how far-reaching the gentleman's amendment is? I can say to the gentleman that the Committee on Banking and Currency needs no guardianship by any other committee. We are as truly interested in the welfare of the farmers of the country as any other committee of this Congress. Many of the Members on that committee have large farming sections in their districts. They do not need the guardianship or patronizing advice of any other committee. They will meet in the spirit of taking care of the farmer's interest and in taking care of his interest we will take care of the public weal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate.

Mr. SPENCE. Certainly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has stated that the Senate has adopted an amendment similar to the one he has offered.

Mr. SPENCE. No, no. Similar to the one you have offered. That is what I said was the objection to your amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If my amendment is adopted, then, according to the gentleman's interpretation, it would not be in conference; it would be agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that is the way we want it.

Mr. SPENCE. It would be a final settlement of it without any consideration and without any hearings. I did not say that the Senate had adopted an amendment such as I have offered, but such as the one which the gentleman has offered. Therefore there is nothing to go to conference. We would finally have accepted an amendment that we had had no consideration of in the Banking and Currency Committee to whom it ought to be referred.

What is unreasonable about continuing the present act for 90 days? It is the act that was the result of hearings; it is an act that has accomplished its purpose; it is an act that has protected the farmer, and it will give us time to have a hearing on the subject. We will give the gentleman an opportunity to be heard on his bill, and we will proceed in an orderly way to arrive at a conclusion after consideration and judgment, and there is certainly nothing unreasonable in my request, and I hope the House will adopt the amendment I

have offered. I hope the House will not override the right of the Committee on Banking and Currency to consider this matter in an orderly fashion under the rules of the House and give the Members the benefit of a report which will analyze the proposal and give you all the facts.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel sure every Member of the House approaches legislation and votes in the way that he feels will be for the best interest of the country. I have never been for controls, and I think it might be well for those who are asking to be shackled by controls to examine what happened under the OPA.

During the year previous to Pearl Harbor 50,000 food outlets closed their doors. Labor was scarce, and operating costs were mounting steadily, but ceiling prices were frozen under OPA.

I recall that in the first quarter of 1943 about 5,000 grocers and butchers closed their shops every month. On one day in March 1943 the New York State Retail Merchants Association recorded arrivals of 62 carloads of potatoes as compared with 143 carloads on the same day of the previous year. Oranges were 10 carloads, against 21 a year earlier; fresh peas, 1 carload against 33; spinach, 6 carloads against 26; grapefruit, 10 carloads against 26. Total cars of all fruits and vegetables on track in the New York market that day were 292, against 554 a year earlier. The same situation developed in poultry.

I recall that during 1942 the grocery manufacturers of America maintained almost daily contact in Washington with no less than 21 Federal agencies—certificates, amendments, special orders, interpretations, from OPA, WPB, FSA, BLS, FCA, FDA, FWA, OCD, OLLA, USI, and ODHWS.

In February 1943 the Byrd committee reported to the Senate that in a period of 6 months the OPA had "issued and requested statistical data on 7,715,229 report forms, exclusive of rationing forms and instructions." Yet OPA, in that period, was only one of 48 Federal agencies sending out questionnaires to businessmen.

The OPA topped the list with 1,096 different forms.

I recall definitely that in October 1943, when butter was unobtainable in several large cities, and available only in quarter-pound lots generally, an official report showed 221 million pounds of butter impounded in cold storage by the Federal Government, about 6.7 pounds for each of the 33,000,000 families in the United States. Worst of all, much of this butter had been in storage so long it was unfit for human consumption.

I am sure that many Members will recall the report submitted to the House of Representatives in November 1943 covering nonrecoverable losses in Government-owned food spoilage. This report included 2,739,000 pounds of dried beans and peas which had become mouldy and weevil-infested; 295,000 pounds of wheat cereal; 234,620 pounds of strawberry preserves, mouldy; 113,083 pounds of canned salmon—rusty cans;

121,600 pounds of potatoes—old stock; 138,750 pounds of fresh onions—decayed; 69,804 pounds of canned tomatoes—spoiled; 74,064 pounds of canned peaches—rusty cans.

Another list carried items spoiled but partially salvageable. This list included 1,939,000 pounds of rolled oats, damaged by rodents; 47,420 pounds of canned chicken; 240,000 pounds of canned salmon; 102,700 pounds of mouldy beans.

At Zanesville, Ohio, 30 carloads of evaporated milk were on hand at least 3 months on Government account when the cans began to explode.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what you are rushing into now under these controls. Memories are short. In less than 11 years the people have forgotten apparently the turmoil and shortages due to OPA. Now we propose to repeat that history and I am against it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct my amendment by striking out "August 1, 1951," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1952."

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Minnesota has objected. An amendment can be prepared and offered to make it 12 months, and I hope it will be accepted.

I am not saying that the gentleman from Minnesota is wrong, I do not know, but in the interest of orderly procedure and good judgment in legislation and acting in a manner that we should act with discretion, it occurs to me that the safe way is not to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and make it a part of this bill. If we do, it is cemented in the law then and there is nothing in conference to talk about, there is no area of disagreement between the two Houses. As I stated, it is sealed in the law. The gentleman from Minnesota wants it that way. Well, I suppose if we understood it like the gentleman from Minnesota possibly we would feel the same way. But we do not understand it that way.

We have not had any hearings on this matter, it has been given no consideration. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency offers to give it immediate consideration after this bill is out of the way. Then we will hear the gentleman from Minnesota and if he is right we will be on his side and will report a bill out.

The amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is to extend the present law for 60 days after expiration, which in practice will mean 90 days. He asked unanimous consent to extend the present law, in effect, for 12 months, but the gentleman from Minnesota objected to that. I do not see why he objected but he did object.

An amendment will undoubtedly be offered to amend the substitute offered

by the gentleman from Kentucky to make it 12 months. Certainly no one can object to that. Then the two will go to conference, the existing law and the Senate amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota. The conferees in that area of disagreement will have something to work on. If there is something being done that is not in the public interest, it can be stopped, it can be prevented; but if you cement it in the present bill, we have no area of disagreement at all. The conferees are absolutely helpless.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection to that amendment. Will not the gentleman do that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have been informed that when a House bill is amended, even though there is identical language in a Senate bill, it is still subject to conference.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no; the gentleman is not correct. He has been here a long time, because I have been here 23 years. I believe the gentleman has been here that long.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A little longer than that.

Mr. PATMAN. A little longer; yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Parliamentarian has advised me that when the House amends its own bill, even though there is a similar provision in the Senate bill, and we do not amend the Senate bill, that it is subject to amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that is in the shadow of trickery, and we are not going to work any trickery here.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not engage in that kind of trickery.

Mr. PATMAN. And we do not want to be compelled to do it to protect the public interest. So save us from a situation where we might be constrained to do something against the rules to protect the public interest. Let us fix this thing so that there will be an area of disagreement, and then if the gentleman is right he should not object, because right will prevail.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. It is difficult for me to understand how the Committee on Banking and Currency can suggest that the committee is taken by surprise by this amendment in view of the fact that the House of Representatives inserted almost a similar provision in the stop-gap legislation which continued the operation for an additional 30 days.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that gives us some time to study it. We have plenty of time.

Mr. COOLEY. You have already had a week's time.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but we still have time. This is only the 10th day of July, and we have been up to the deadline a lot closer than 21 days before this.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might say to the gentleman that I introduced a bill on June 5, and on the 6th I wrote a letter to the chairman and asked for a hearing on it, and up to this date I have not received a hearing. I know you have been busy.

Mr. PATMAN. For the obvious reason that the chairman has been conducting hearings night and day, and even Saturdays.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand, and I am not criticizing him for that.

Mr. PATMAN. And even the ambitious and aggressive Committee on Agriculture has not been doing that well.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is why it is necessary to enact this amendment as a part of this law.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We are trying to carry out the intention that you have in your mind. Today we are offering an amendment to amend the present bill. Now, that goes to conference. That gives us an opportunity to investigate without a formal hearing, and certainly it is fair, and I hope you will not object to this amendment. That goes to conference, and if we are convinced that your amendment is better than the present law, we will accept it. You certainly are entitled to some kind of a hearing, and I ask the Members to vote for this amendment to the existing law, not that we do not want to have a hearing, but we will find out from some witnesses if the present law is better for the people of the country. I think this is a fair solution, and I think you ought to go along with it, because we are trying to help you out.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I have read the Andresen amendment and I have read the committee substitute. The Andresen amendment speaks of cheese and cheese products. Is that included under the present law, or is that a new one?

Mr. PATMAN. That is another thing we do not know about in other words, we are legislating in the dark.

Mr. JAVITS. If it is a new one, I think that puts a different light on the situation.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman will admit that some commodities are included that are not in the present law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I stated that in my statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Each one is a basic commodity. We do not know how far it will go.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Spence substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN to the substitute offered by Mr. SPENCE:

"SEC. 104. The act of June 30, 1950, Public Law 590, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'August 1,

1951,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1952.'"

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is offered in view of the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], did not see fit to permit the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to amend his own amendment accordingly. As far as the Committee on Banking and Currency is concerned, I think the impression has been left that we are not looking after the farmers. I desire to invite your attention to the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency has a record of going so far in the interest of the farmers that by unanimous consent we lowered the parity law one time. When the first Price Control Act was passed by Congress the latter part of 1941 or early part of 1942, January 8, I believe it was, when it became law, we had a provision inserted by the Banking and Currency Committee providing for 110 percent of parity. Now, no other committee of Congress ever did that well for the farmers. We went too far. We went so far we had to go back and lower it. So our committee has not been on the side of being stingy with the farmers, we have been on the side of being generous with the farmers.

Our committee is composed of Representatives from farming districts just like most of the other committees of this House. We have the interest of agriculture at heart just like any other committee of this House. We yield to no committee of this House in our interest in and appreciation of the farmers of the country. We want to do what is necessary to keep them prosperous, recognizing, as has been said here, that if the farmers are not prosperous the country is not prosperous. We must maintain a sound, prosperous agriculture. We all realize that. Now I want to appeal to the Members of the House if this is not absolutely sound.

We have before our committee now a bill to amend the present act on imports of fats and oils, to extend it for 1 year. We have not had an opportunity to hold hearings on that bill by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] because it involves other commodities. The gentleman here admits it involves other commodities than the present law. We want to hear the testimony on it. We do not want to act in the dark. We have plenty of time. We have 21 days. The chairman has promised a hearing immediately after this bill passes. A promise from the gentleman from Kentucky means it will be done. He is a man of honor, a man of integrity. No one ever questions his word. He has told us we are going to have that hearing. Then if the gentleman from Minnesota can make a case for the additional commodities we will be on his side. We will report his bill. But if he does not, we will not, we will report the present law just as it is. So why not pass this extension of 12 months, and then it will be in the House bill. The other bill in the Senate, meeting us half way, contains a proposal advanced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] just exactly as he has put it in this

bill. Then we will have an area of disagreement. If there is anything wrong about the Andresen matter we can do something about it. If it is all right, we can agree to the Senate provision. But if you accept the Andresen amendment now you have cemented it in the bill and there is no way on earth for the conferees to change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." It has to remain exactly that way.

It does not seem to me like that is the right way to legislate. If there are two ways to do something and one is a good, safe, reasonable way and the other is uncertain, let us do it the reasonable way.

This Andresen amendment embraces commodities the present law does not embrace. We are willing to have a hearing on the additional commodities. The chairman says so. We do not object to that. But let us extend the present law now, and then meet with the Senate conferees and do what is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Andresen amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you do not need to try and convince something is wrong, and uncertain about this language we have in the Andresen amendment. It is very plain, fair and constructive. It states that import controls of fats and oils, peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations.

If it is necessary for national defense to bring those things in, I have no objection to bringing them in. But the Andresen amendment also states this, and this is where the certainty and the protection come in:

No imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions.

Why do you want to bring in imports which will upset the program of our domestic production at present levels or higher levels if the Department of Agriculture says we need those higher levels of production? Higher levels should be protected. That is what the gentleman wants to do. He wants to protect our present production and higher production if necessary—to do what? To accomplish the main purpose of the law. Where is there anything wrong in that? Why does the Committee on Banking and Currency want to further consider that proposition?

That is just cold-blooded Americanism, and that is what we want in this proposition. If these imports interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or products they must not come in until 1953. What is wrong with that? Do you want to upset the domestic storing activities? Do you want to upset the marketing activities of our domestic procedure? If you do not want to upset

those things, then adopt the Andresen amendment.

Now, the third and last proposition—if these imports result in any unnecessary burden or expenditure in any Government price-support program, they must not come here until 1953. What is wrong with that?

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. And we are supporting oil-producing commodities such as peanuts and cottonseed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly. When you vote against this amendment you will vote to defeat your idea and to destroy your own program. I am sure we do not need any further time to consider that sort of proposition. We should adopt this amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the Government must own the commodities and own the fats and oils in the support program before this would go into operation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the present time the Government does not own any of these fats and oils and all this does is to seek to stop the Government from being put in a position of having to buy these fats and oils; and, in other words, to save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct. This is protection all the way through.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The Commodity Credit Corporation sent me a letter this morning stating they had reduced their inventories over a billion dollars, I believe, and this will add that billion dollars back to their inventories if the commodities come, because the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the law, is bound to buy American-produced products if there is no other market for them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct. They have to do it.

Mr. ALBERT. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This will save money for the taxpayers and protect American agriculture at the same time.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. Can the gentleman tell us why the Committee on Banking and Currency would need to hold hearings to determine whether or not we should permit imports into the United States of products at the very time that the Government of the United States is spending he taxpayers' money to support that market?

Mr. CRAWFORD. And which imports would upset this program? Of course they do not need any hearings on that.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Has the gentleman considered the impact this amendment would have on our relations with other countries with whom we have reciprocal trade agreements, and the ECA countries?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, wait a minute, if we are going to upset the domestic production of any commodity or upset the orderly domestic storing activities which will result in any unnecessary burden of expenditure on Government price-support programs, in order to protect the reciprocal trade-agreements program—if we are going to go that far, we might as well kick American agriculture in the pants and tell them to go rustle for themselves.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. We have had almost the same provision in the law and there has been no complaint about any conflict with reciprocal trade treaties.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right, the only difference is that we have had one or two more products added.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We want to adopt the Andresen amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take any more time than is necessary, but I think a word or two ought to be said to clear up the situation. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and myself have offered an amendment to the bill to take care of import licensing. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has introduced a substitute amendment which would carry on the present law for another year. The present law is not sufficient to adequately meet the situation. There are only two instances in which imports of these commodities can be stopped. First, the President must find that such controls are essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply. That does not help relieve the situation at all. That applies to commodities in short supply. Second, essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses. That does not meet our situation. So to adopt the substitute will not meet the situation at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to stress what the gentleman has said, that before the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee [Mr. SPENCE] or by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] goes into effect, the Government must have these surpluses. At the present time the Government does not have these surpluses of these commodities. Our amendment seeks to prevent the Government from getting them, in order to have orderly marketing in this country. So on fats and oils and dairy products the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr.

SPENCE] will not prevail, and imports will come into the United States.

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

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman comes from a peanut-growing section of the country.

Mr. ABBITT. Yes.

Mr. SPENCE. Have not peanuts been taken care of under the present act?

Mr. ABBITT. Peanuts have been taken care of.

Mr. SPENCE. Has not butter been taken care of? What agricultural product has not been taken care of under the present act?

Mr. ABBITT. The only answer I can give the gentleman is that when this matter came up and it looked like controls would expire on June 30, our very efficient chairman called a conference of members of the committee interested in this matter. We have certain people from the Department of Agriculture, and they told us then that under the present law it was doubtful if they protect our products.

Mr. SPENCE. Because the act was about to expire. Was that not the reason?

Mr. ABBITT. No, sir. They said that under the language there had to be two things. There must either be a short supply or it must be essential to the orderly liquidations of temporary surpluses.

Mr. SPENCE. What agricultural product has not been taken care of at the present time?

Mr. ABBITT. I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. They have all been taken care of. The act is very wide in its scope. I have heard no complaints from all of the people who are producing oils and fats, butter and butter products. They knew that it protected them.

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

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not a fact that since the war there have been in the Commodity Credit Corporation storehouse surpluses of these commodities, and therefore the provisions of the law were necessarily put into effect; whereas at the present time those surpluses have been reduced and we are putting ourselves in the position of making it impossible to operate this law, by reason of the fact that this condition is no longer present?

Mr. ABBITT. The gentleman is exactly right. Last year we had about 10,000,000 bales of cotton. There was a short supply. The same was true of all these other things.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I understand the gentleman himself introduced a bill along this line. What is the difference between the gentleman's bill and the present law and the Andresen amendment?

Mr. ABBITT. I introduced a bill continuing the present law, with an added amendment, which takes care of the situation to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] referred.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman read that amendment?

Mr. ABBITT. "Essential to the orderly marketing of commodities under price control or diversion program." But that is not in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. Unless we have that added to the present law or our amendment we might just as well not have any law, so far as keeping out these products is concerned at the present time.

First. These are abnormal times in which we find ourselves, and many of the adjustments which were set in motion after the cessation of hostilities in World War II will not have been completed by the time the current law expires. Specifically, adjustments are still being made with respect to the peanut program and while impressive progress has been made toward bringing supplies into line with demand, I am reliably informed that the CCC, on the basis of estimated yields this year, might very well lose over \$3,500,000 on peanuts. Certainly we are not justified in adding to this burden by stimulating the importation of peanuts at the time when a Government agency is doing everything within its power to bring supplies into line with demand.

There is nothing unfair or out of keeping with the spirit of the general agreement on trade and tariff in connection with the protection of our domestic peanut industry. Fundamentally, the United States is producing peanuts for edible market in the United States. Practically all of the remaining production of peanuts throughout the world is for oil on a much lower-priced market. By opening our domestic edible market to foreign produced peanuts we are providing foreign producers with a high priced edible market for which their nuts were not originally produced. The current acreage adjustment program with respect to peanuts in the United States provides for determining yields on a 5-year average basis. Over a period of time such a basis has proven to be acceptable and sound. However, it does mean that in a period such as we are encountering now, it does not fully reflect probable yields. Accordingly, it will take a little more time to properly bring supply into line with demand in this country.

Second. I understand the CCC still holds in excess of 500,000 pounds of linseed oil at an aggregate cost of approximately \$145,000,000, which is the carry-over from the production of flaxseed in World War II. Additional time is needed for orderly reduction of these stocks.

The two main sources from which we could expect importation of flaxseed, which would interfere with the orderly marketing of this commodity which was acquired under price support, are Argentina and Canada. While it is true that supplies in the Argentine have been reduced materially, they have increased their acreage this year approximately

1,500,000 acres, which amounts to a 50-percent increase in acreage. There is little doubt but what many circumstances and forces would operate to bring a substantial portion of Argentine production into this country unless controlled.

Last year Canada had a short flax crop. There is no indication that last year's short Canadian crop will be repeated this year.

Third. The present market in the United States for rice is sufficiently high that it would tend to draw supplies from far-eastern markets to the United States at a time when food which is produced in the Far East should be kept in that area. In view of the current unsettled times, it is quite obvious that we should take steps now to see that the necessary legislation is passed to protect the gains we have already made in solving our agricultural adjustment problems.

Fourth. For those of you who believe that this proposal is sufficiently covered by the Defense Production Act of 1950, let me explain that the law is not sufficiently clear to say with absolute certainty that the Defense Production Act of 1950 will be interpreted to permit the control of imports such as we have in mind. Accordingly, I urge you to pass this legislation and leave no doubt as to the intention of the Congress.

Fifth. The Department of Agriculture has very strongly urged that the cotton producers of the United States increase their production from 10,000,000 bales in 1950 to 16,000,000 bales in 1951. The present prospects indicate that the American farmer has responded to this appeal and will not only meet the goal of 16,000,000 bales, but probably will exceed it. This will result in the production of huge quantities of cottonseed oil. It is patently absurd for the Congress of the United States to say to the cotton grower: "You should increase your production of cotton, and incidentally cottonseed, and at the same time while you are increasing your production in response to our needs, we are going to aid and abet the lowering of the price you will receive for the cottonseed by opening up importation of fats and oils which are not needed in this country, but are very definitely needed in the countries from which they would be exported to this country."

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we have members on both sides of the Committee on Agriculture who seem to be satisfied that the Andresen amendment should be adopted. I think that it is best that we do take this language the Senate has adopted, for by so doing we can cement it into law, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has so well stated, though he does not approve of such action. Personally, I want to cement it into law. I do not want the President to have the opportunity to veto the same restrictions as to imports of competing farm products, and he would have that opportunity if we followed the advice of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. PATMAN] and attempted to reenact the present law. Let us express the will of the House today and legislate as we feel is right. I have every confidence in the members of the Committee on Agriculture and in my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], who has always worked hard for the best interests of our dairy farmers. Why in the name of common sense should we, on the one hand, spend huge sums to support farm commodity prices and then, on the other hand, open our Nation's doors wide to competing products produced by cheap labor?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT]?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In response to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], when he asked what farm products are not protected, as I understood the gentleman's presentation none of them are protected unless they fit into those two categories which the gentleman enumerated.

Mr. ABBITT. That is exactly right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So the answer to the question of the gentleman from Kentucky is that none are protected unless that amendment is put in.

Mr. ABBITT. That is right; as was pointed out so well by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], we no longer have these circumstances, so we will not be protected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In conclusion, let us vote down the Spence substitute and accept the Andresen amendment. Millions of farmers who produce hogs, dairy products, and flaxseed will have added incentive to work long hours and produce ample food so necessary to our Nation at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. Too long and too often have the farmers of Iowa and the Nation been made the victims of foreign fats and oil imports, produced by cheap labor.

I am opposed to undermining American farmers, labor and industry through the importation of any foreign products unless there is a tariff differential representing the differential in cost of production and the American standard of living.

I will never knowingly vote for any piece of legislation that will permit Lever Bros. and the soap monopoly or any other industry in this country to purchase raw material on a cheap foreign labor market and then sell the finished product in this country at a price based on the American raw material and labor market.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and wish to speak in opposition to the Andresen amendment.

I find on looking over the Andresen amendment that it affords no protection at all to our national defense effort. When it comes to national interest and the defense effort we are not farmers, we are not city folks, we are not in any special category except that we are all

Americans, and our first thought is and must be for the protection of this country. I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] feels the same way, but I can find nothing in his amendment to meet the situation in which we now find ourselves, the shortage of edible fats. Fats and oils are used in many things that enter into our war effort, and we cannot let prohibition against the importation of fats and oils go to the point where it interferes with the manufacture of our war materials, and that is what the gentleman's amendment would do. There is everything in the amendment that would limit the defense efforts of the United States since we are admittedly in short supply of fats and oils. If the gentleman can show me where I am mistaken about his amendment I would be very glad to have him do so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that it is in the interest of national defense to secure an abundant production of all kinds of foods, fats, and oils?

Mr. McKINNON. I will be glad to answer this way: I think our economy wants a full production and we want to do everything we can to encourage full production; but if due to reasons beyond our control we cannot get sufficient fats and oils for the war effort, for war production, then we must be able to import them. The gentleman's amendment does not provide for that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Oh, yes; my amendment takes care of securing an abundant production of linseed oil and other oils that go into paints. So if the gentleman is interested particularly in that angle he is going to get abundant production of those oils.

Mr. McKINNON. Will the gentleman be more specific?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say further that we have seen the time in this country when the shortage of fats and oils has been so bad that we were gouged by other countries of the world in our efforts to secure raw materials for the war effort to keep up production in this country. We had to pay \$3.22 a pound for pepper and 67 cents for rubber, and other things proportionately.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceive how pepper and rubber enter into the production of fats and oils, edible or otherwise.

I want to say simply that last year we reported this bill out and favored it because there was a surplus. There is no surplus now. In the last 12-month period flaxseed, for instance, was selling at about four times what it sold for in the 1935-39 period. If 400 percent increase is not sufficient incentive to secure the necessary production of flaxseed oil, I think we should not tie our hands on national defense by prohibiting further importation of flaxseed oil.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is mistaken in the price of flaxseed. The approximate price of flaxseed was \$4 per bushel. It was up to \$7 per bushel during the war. It certainly is not four times today what it was in 1935. It is about 30 percent over.

Mr. McKINNON. The Department of Agriculture reports the price of flaxseed in April of 1951 at \$4.37. In the 1935-39 average the price was \$1.69, practically four times as much. Now, if that kind of price incentive cannot produce enough flaxseed to take care of our war effort, I think our war effort comes before the protection of a few people.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman think any one of these conditions in the Andersen amendment would prohibit this country from bringing into it any of these fats and oils if the defense effort should require it, and local production could not meet the demand?

Mr. McKINNON. That is the way I read it. I asked the gentleman for that clarification. I do not object to seeing that our own farm bloc gets adequate protection and incentive for production. We want to keep our domestic production high.

Mr. ALBERT. What in the amendment leads the gentleman to think that if the defense effort of the country would require imports and American agriculture could not produce it, we could not bring it in?

Mr. McKINNON. Read the amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Where in the amendment?

Mr. McKINNON. The amendment simply says that notwithstanding the provisions of any other law the import controls on fats and oils are prohibited from coming in if it will do one of three things.

Mr. ALBERT. That is right.

Mr. McKINNON. First, will reduce the domestic production, which is a very broad thing, and, second, interfere with the orderly domestic storing, and, third, result in unnecessary burden of expenditure.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to linseed oil. The Government itself, the Commodity Credit Corporation, owns 1 year's supply of linseed oil from a crop that it purchased 2 years ago when the Government purchased the entire crop of flaxseed in this country. They have all kinds of flaxseed. With the rest of the provisions of the bill, before they become operative, under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky, the Government would have to

own all of these surpluses before the embargo could be put into operation. What my amendment seeks to do is to have an orderly production in this country and orderly marketing, so that the Government will not have to waste the taxpayers' money under the support program to buy fats and oils, butter, cheese, and these other items.

I hope I have made myself clear that there is an ample supply of linseed oil in this country because the United States Government owns one full year's supply of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to point out that during that year the gentleman is describing the great stockpile on the Government shelf the price of flaxseed went from \$3.68 to \$4.37. If the gentleman is willing to write into his amendment, if the war effort necessitates these fats and oils may be brought in for the protection of our country, that is one thing, but the gentleman's amendment does not provide that. There would be a great danger to our national defense and to our welfare to allow special interests to come in here, as this amendment does, and take over the defense of our country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to read the amendment.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I read the amendment, it would prevent the importation of these things, even though it is necessary to stockpile them. I can see the point of the gentleman from Minnesota, if he wants to write an amendment that will lay down certain provisions for the distribution of this stockpile material after the emergency has passed, but, as I read the amendment, it would prevent stockpiling under emergency conditions if the stockpiling itself would constitute a threat to American agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is entirely in error. It would not prevent stockpiling, it would not prevent greater production when ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture to get more linseed.

Mr. McCARTHY. If you bring it in you have a stockpile.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to the substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 61, noes 129.

So the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 65, noes 136.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 2, after line 21, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Add a new section of title 1 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to read as follows:

"Sec. 104. The President shall establish a single central agency to serve as a claimant to present the construction and supply needs of State and local governments and their tax-supported agencies."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the action just taken by the Committee of the Whole, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be corrected to show that it will follow the amendment just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in contrast to the rather complicated matter upon which this House has just been deliberating, the purpose of this amendment is quite simple and quite direct. It is to establish one claimant agency for the various governmental units. During World War II there was such an agency. It was called the Government Requirements Bureau. It operated within the War Production Board.

I suppose it might be said with considerable force that this is an administrative matter and that, therefore, it should be handled by the administrative agencies without action on the part of the Congress. As a matter of fact, however, the assurance has been given several times that such a unified agency would be created, but the months have gone by and that assurance has never been acted upon.

Just about a month ago an order was issued which continues the existing claimant agencies, so that at the present time the local and State governments in order to have their needs presented must act through not one but through at least 19 different claimant agencies. This means that our States, our county and city governments, and our school districts in the States must try to verse themselves in the operations of those 19 agencies, instead of being able to operate through one.

I think it would alleviate a confusing situation for the 168,000 local and State governmental units in this Nation if they were permitted to operate at this time as they were during World War II, through some sort of a single claimant agency.

As I said, perhaps there will be some feeling that it is not necessary to write this into legislation, but this will not be the first time the Congress has found it necessary, because of the dilatory tactics of an administrative agency, to write into law a provision to enact something that has been promised many times by administrators but has never been acted upon. I think it will eliminate confusion and will increase the efficiency of the allocations program if this amendment is adopted.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What difference would there be between the service of the agency about which the gentleman is speaking as compared to the services now rendered by NPA?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This would work through and with the NPA.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the NPA render this kind of service now?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It attempts to. It deals with several claimant agencies that present the case for requirements, just as I would like to have one claimant agency that would present the claims of these governmental units for materials. At the present time, when a school wants materials, it may have to work through the Federal Security Administration, or it may have to work through one or more of the 18 other agencies. There are 19 of them operating with, and dealing with, the local units of government at the present time.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Under the gentleman's amendment, the way it would operate would be that if a school district or any other unit would go to this one central agency, it in turn would know which group among these various war agencies the matter should be taken up with, and would go directly to it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the purpose, to channelize the necessary requests for materials.

Mr. KEATING. It strikes me it would be a very desirable thing. We have all encountered difficulty under the present system.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I can confirm what the gentleman from New York has just said, because we had such a situation with regard to governmental agencies in Milwaukee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am sure you have had.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's point. I think we would be doing a good and real service through the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I also want to commend my colleague for offering this

amendment, and I want to join in sponsoring it. In many instances my office was called to aid the city of Milwaukee in trying to get through the various departments an application with the NPA. Is it not true that if the gentleman's amendment is adopted this agency will provide information and aid to the State and other local governments and help get allocations and priorities, to aid the efforts these local governments are making together and mutually with our other defense and military efforts in the American production job?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the purpose of the amendment, and I believe it will be of real benefit to State and local governmental units.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 2, line 16, after the word "conditions," strike out the words "and exceptions."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it will be noted by reference to section 102 that the President, to prevent hoarding, and for other purposes, may designate certain materials as materials which cannot be hoarded. In order that there might be a better understanding of the matter before us, let me read the forefront of section 102, which does not appear in the copy:

In order to prevent hoarding, no person shall accumulate (1) in excess of the reasonable demands of business, personal, or home consumption, or (2) for the purpose of resale at prices in excess of prevailing market prices, materials which have been designated by the President as scarce materials or materials the supply of which would be threatened by such accumulation. The President shall order published in the Federal Register, and in such other manner as he may deem appropriate, every designation of materials the accumulation of which is unlawful and any withdrawal of such designation.

The amendment proposed is this: "Making such designation the President may prescribe such conditions and exceptions with respect to the accumulation of materials in excess of the reasonable demand," and so forth.

With the language "and exceptions" included it makes possible gross discrimination between corporations, agencies, and individuals. Of course I do not suppose we could presume that in the administration of any law there would be any discrimination in the allocation of materials, but we do have complaints today from small business as well as big business and from individuals that favoritism is being shown in the distribution and allocation of materials.

If the President is authorized to make exceptions in respect to stockpiling and in respect to the amount of material which might be accumulated by any person, then the charge can be made perhaps successfully that exceptions are made in some cases. Now, I do not want anyone to say that merely because I am a Republican favoritism is being shown

to me by the administration over a good, loyal, constitutional Democrat. I do not want anybody to say that because I am a Republican I can have 100 pounds of beef in my deep freeze, but that because another person is a Democrat he can have only 50 pounds. That is what this language says. But, more serious is this situation:

As between two manufacturing concerns, as between, let us say, the Ford Motor Co. and General Motors, under this language an entirely different rule can be set up for the amount of material which the Ford Co. might have to the disadvantage of General Motors. I merely use these two concerns as an example.

In the stockpiling or accumulation of raw materials sometimes lies the answer as to whether a concern can satisfactorily compete with another concern. I do not think we should put any agency of the Government in a position where it can successfully be charged that under the law they can show favoritism to one concern over another concern.

That is the gist of the whole situation. The President may prescribe such conditions as he may see fit for the distribution of goods; but with the amendment which I have offered, favoritism cannot be shown. There can be no exceptions to the general rule. Everybody will have to be treated alike in the allocation of material.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that reasonableness of the amount he got would then be the test.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It might be the test. It also might depend upon the interpretation of the reasonableness of it whether or not a concern is put out of business.

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this is another of those very simple amendments that does nothing except impede the proper administration of the law. In other words, the gentleman offering the amendment says to you that the President may not impose any exceptions or grant any exemptions, as far as the accumulation of material is concerned. He says that it is all right to impose conditions under the anti-hoarding amendment. You have there a provision against the unreasonable accumulation of material, whether it is for home consumption or for national defense or otherwise. In other words, under the proposed amendment if a businessman says, "I am willing to invest my money and buy up outside of this country and import and stockpile for the Government cobalt or aluminum or any other strategic material," the President cannot say, "You can do that." The only

way you can get that material, if you do not grant an exception, is to compel the Government to go out and buy and stockpile that material. The same instance can be multiplied thousands of times. They go right through the entire economy. You will not be able to do those things under this proposal. As a matter of fact, you will even destroy the amendment you have just passed, embargoing the importation of fats and oils and other items in order to build up your production here in order to build up stockpiles. If the President cannot give you an exception so that you can stockpile linseed oil or any of the other items as you increase production—and if you increase production only as far as you can consume it, it will do no good—you vitiate all of the provisions in the law which tend to effectuate the allocation and priorities title of this bill.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Was not the word "exception" placed in there in order that he might have authority to help the small dealer?

Mr. MULTER. That was one of the things we had in mind. You cannot possibly treat a small-business man the same as a big fellow. The big fellow buys an inventory of a million dollars. The small fellow will buy only a thousand dollars worth, but his \$1,000 inventory may be 100 percent more than he had last year, while the million-dollar inventory may be a drop in the bucket to the big fellow.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the use of the word "conditions" would take care of that situation, because conditions could be made general; and if the purpose were to have general classification, then those conditions could be accepted.

Mr. MULTER. If "exceptions" are included in "conditions," why take the word "exceptions" out of the law? Why did we put it in there in the first place if we did not intend it to cover two different provisions?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, I have always proceeded on the theory that when additional words are used they mean something. I do not believe that "conditions" is synonymous with "exceptions."

Mr. MULTER. I agree. And that answers the argument you made a moment ago. We need the word "exceptions" as well as "conditions." The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] is offering an amendment to take out the word "exceptions."

Mr. HALLECK. The point you made a moment ago seemed to indicate that if the word "exceptions" were taken out, the small business might thereby be prejudiced.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not hold with that at all because I think that under the application of the word "conditions," small business as a class could be taken care of under the conditions imposed.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot understand how you can write a condition as a part of a regulation so as to grant a specific exemption.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. If the antihoarding provisions are sound in order to prevent inflationary trends, and I believe they are, then does not the granting of exceptions completely vitiate the basic provision against hoarding?

Mr. MULTER. Of course it does not.

Mr. KEATING. Why not? If anybody can grant blanket exceptions here, there, and yonder?

Mr. MULTER. The answer to that is very simple: If you do not trust the President, do not pass this law. This law vests all of these authorities in the President.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. MULTER. If you are not going to trust him as to one of these powers, you certainly cannot trust him as to any. I can point out one department of our Government that is operating satisfactorily to the Republicans. The distinguished chairman of our committee joined me in asking questions a few moments ago about the embargo amendment and you found unanimity of opinion among the Republicans that at least as to that provision of law the Department of Agriculture is operating satisfactorily under your President. Every other department is operating under our President. I am satisfied that all departments are operating satisfactorily under the same President.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 80, noes 86.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 126, noes 111.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly, it was about a year ago that the President sent up to the Congress a request for what was known as a Defense Production Authority that had to do primarily with priorities, allocations, requisitions, expansion of production, and consumer-real estate credits. It will be recalled that this was shortly after the President had committed our forces to Korea. After that message came to the Congress it became apparent throughout the country that the impact on our economy would be

such as to, in all likelihood, bring about an increase in prices in many fields and further fire the fuels of inflation which have beset us for many years. Because of that fact there arose across the country an insistent demand that the Congress do something affirmatively and effectively to deal with the problem of price and wage stabilization. It is significant that no request came from the White House for any such action. The request as it came to the Congress on that occasion came from the people, and as the result of that request, which I say was overwhelming, the Congress responded, and in September of last year enacted the Defense Production Authority Act, which included added titles dealing with price and wage stabilization.

There was considerable controversy about this at the time. However, I think the larger part of the argument revolved around the original request from the White House than around the provision of wage and price stabilization.

Today the administration, which a year ago not only did not ask for anything to deal with price and wage stabilization but as a matter of fact opposed it, is here putting the chief emphasis on added authority to deal with price and wage stabilization. Now we are hearing again the talk of pressure groups, pressure groups supposedly sinister, or alleged to be sinister, that somehow or other are working their will upon the Congress. Well, let me say that I have listened to that sort of talk from people in the Government so long that I am getting pretty tired of it.

I resent the implication that the Congress of the United States, sent here by the people to represent them, is subservient to the will of so-called pressure groups. I served on the Lobby Investigating Committee in the last Congress and I observed there the tremendous effort that was made by some to try to make it appear that all private interests or private lobbying organizations, whatever they may be, are sinister and bad. Yet if the lobbying comes from the departments downtown, we are told it is all good. There again, no one was able to make anything like that stick. Of course, it is only important now as we hear again the drums of the people in the Government downtown beating, prodding, going out over the airways and into the press, trying to make it appear that there is some sort of a sell-out going on here in the Congress. Again, I say, I resent that. And we have come to a point where we hear the suggestion that the cease-fire operations now going on in Korea are nothing but some sort of a Communist threat to wreck the control program in this country. That will certainly be sad news to a lot of the boys in Korea and to a lot of people in this country who have been led to believe that those cease-fire talks might really produce something that would bring about peace. I would still like to believe it in spite of all the suggestions that have been made.

Today, of course, there is talk about the impact of the situation that is going on in the country in respect to prices; people worrying about inflation. Well,

I might suggest that some people should have been worried about that a long time ago. An eminent economist reported the other day that inflation, since the days of the depression, has cost the person with his money invested in dollars 61 times as much as was lost by all of the people in the bank failures during the depression.

Of course, we are all worried about inflation and high prices. The question is, What are we going to do about it? Every housewife in Indiana knows when a pot boils over on the stove, the only sensible thing to do is to turn down the fire under the pot. She knows that trying to hold down the lid will not do any good, certainly for not very long.

In fact, she knows she would get badly scalded if she tried to do that.

By the same token, we cannot hope to reduce the pressure on our economic system by holding the lid down on prices and wages by direct controls alone. We have to get at the fire which is generating the inflation steam.

Much of this heat results from the administration's spending policy. There is no evidence that the administration, for all its protestations about concern for the consumer and the taxpayer, is doing a thing to cut back on Federal spending. In fact, the Congress has been meeting with administration resistance at every turn in its efforts to reduce appropriations.

Moreover, the administration has consistently stifled, rather than promoted, the consumer production so vitally needed, and it has failed to exercise basic credit and monetary controls.

Of course, none of us should delude ourselves that the passage of this bill or any other bill would satisfy an administration which has already demonstrated its total inability or unwillingness, probably a combination of both, to effectively and sincerely tackle the basic problems of inflation.

Regardless of what we do or what we do not do, the administration, the folks downtown, are already primed to blame the Congress for whatever further mess that same administration makes of the situation in which the Nation now finds itself.

Yes, the White House is all set to blame the Congress, and this time you know it will be a Democrat-controlled Congress, for conditions which can be laid directly on the doorstep of incompetent administrative leadership.

Let me emphasize again what has already been pointed out.

The Congress did pass legislation last September which, had there been any intelligent foresight on the part of the administration, might well have proved an effective brake on inflation. As a matter of fact, some of us fought for what undoubtedly would have been a much more effective and equitable bill, that was known as the Kunkel substitute.

But we did give the White House and the administration the tools with which to do a job.

What happened?

The White House and the Truman administration insisted loudly that it did not need and did not want control over

wages and prices. That was in September of 1950. I have tried to figure out why they felt that way about it, and maybe it goes back to that campaign oratory of the then candidate for Vice President, Mr. BARKLEY, who went to Springfield, Ill., on August 18, 1948, and said:

It is legitimate for me to ask today whether you want to change back from \$40 cattle and \$30 hogs.

In other words, if you want \$40 cattle and \$30 hogs, vote the Democratic ticket.

The candidate for President had something to say about that:

I want to say to you that if the farmers of this country know which side their bread is buttered on—and I believe they do—they're not going to put this Republican gang in control of the Government.

It is obvious that apparently a lot of farmers must have believed that.

The President also said:

Never in the world were the farmers of any republic or any kingdom or any other country as prosperous as the farmers of the United States.

Then cattle were about \$40. Of course, you orators in the city were saying to the city folks, "These awful folks are responsible for dollar beefsteak in the city." But whether you know it or not, if you come from the city, there is a lot more to the steer than beefsteak. If he is \$40 a hundred, you do not carve out steaks at less than a dollar a pound, if you make it at that. As a matter of fact, today cattle are about \$32 in Chicago and hogs are \$23.

The contract that you folks were making in that campaign was a 4-year contract. I sometimes wonder what you are concerned about. You ought to take the responsibility for high beef prices, if the people in the cities do not like it.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. When you talk about the price of beefsteak, everyone wants to see it lower, of course. But let us take another look at the record. The administration did not want controls last September or during the months that followed.

But they want even more controls now—more controls and what they choose to call roll-backs.

Having missed the bus in September, they would like to roll back the calendar—and I refer to the administration people—piling confusion on top of confusion because they failed to act at the proper time.

Instead of acting, the administration vacillated, stalled, yes, and looked the other way, for months after adequate executive powers were on the books. Cattle were \$27 last fall, and again I say they are \$32 now.

Not until the fat was in the fire did the administration attempt action. Not until the simmering pot was coming to

a rolling boil did the administration attempt action. And even then such action was a half-hearted attempt to apply controls under a formula that put politics before national welfare.

Every move was made with an eye to political consequences.

And now, having first failed to use the powers granted to the Executive, and then having abused those powers, the administration wails that more absolute and far-reaching authority is necessary.

I say that regardless of what powers we might see fit to grant we would still face a whining protest that the Congress had not gone far enough.

Our problem today is not only how best to control inflation. It is also how to get the job done, after the Congress agrees once more on measures, by an administration of proven incompetence.

We might just as well realize, to put it bluntly, that the Congress, no matter how hard it might try, cannot legislate competence into the Truman administration.

The people of this country have—and we might as well face this basic fact—the people of this country have lost faith in the ability of this administration to cope with the problems we find before us.

The people realize—and not without abundant evidence—that in the final analysis the Congress can only create tools in the form of laws. And no law, no matter how expertly conceived, is of any value unless it is wisely administered.

That, really, is our problem: How to achieve sincere, effective administration of the laws passed by the Congress.

We have not been getting effective, sincere administration and we are not going to get it.

The people have lost faith in the administration and so has the Congress.

There is no good reason why this great Nation cannot do the job that needs to be done without putting everybody into an unnecessary strait-jacket of regimentation and control.

The trouble lies in the fact that this administration insists on tying to the emergency its carefully laid plans for an ever-increasing Government stranglehold on our national economic system.

It insists on exploiting an emergency atmosphere to its own ends.

Those ends are bigger spending proposals, bigger bureaucracy, more jobs for party faithful, higher taxes, and more controls.

What we really need is an honest desire by the administration to get this job done with a minimum of dislocation to all segments of our people.

I am convinced that an intelligent assessment of the program we must undertake, an assessment made with the reasonable security of America in mind, along with a realistic appraisal of our own capabilities, will disclose that we can do the job that needs to be done from here on out. And it will disclose, further, that it can be done without all this hamstringing of industry, business, labor, and agriculture that is proposed.

The administration asks for more authority when it has not shown an ability to intelligently use what has already been extended.

What the administration really needs is a genuine will to make the American system work as it was designed to work—as a system of free men who produce best when they are not saddled with restrictions, regimentation, and control.

There is, I repeat, no bill that this Congress could pass which could create in this administration that sort of will.

The best we can do under the circumstances is to resist the efforts of the White House to impose an ever-increasing load of debt and an unnecessary tightening net of controls around our people.

In its failure to cope with the problems of the hour the administration will once again attempt to pin the blame for its own shortcomings on the Congress.

This it will attempt to do regardless of the action we take here.

I am confident, however, that the people of this country have been fooled for the last time by Mr. Truman and his Socialist-minded coterie. I believe the people still have faith in the deliberations of the Congress.

We should not let them down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I always make a special effort to be present to listen to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. During the years that he has served with me in the House I have found him very interesting. In fact, I can truthfully say that I find him very amusing. His ability to talk all around a piece of legislation without disclosing his point of view has afforded me many a laugh.

The gentleman from Indiana is like the late James J. Corbett, former heavyweight champion boxer of the world. Corbett, after he retired, was famous for his inability to pick a winner. The gentleman from Indiana is a worthy successor to Corbett's laurels. His inability to feel the pulse of the people and to recognize their wants is common to the party for which he is such an able mouthpiece. The failure of his party to recognize the intelligence of the citizenry of this country has kept that party out of political power in the Federal Government for almost a quarter of a century. Old-time vaudevillians would change their act every 6 months or a year, but the Republican Party cannot see innovations of that type. They are still trying to sell the old act with the same songs and chatter that they used a quarter of a century ago. Truthfully, they have become the Cherry sisters of politics.

I do not believe that politics should enter into the question of controls, but unfortunately the gentleman from Indiana chose to put this question on the political stage. Over a year and a half ago, the gentleman from Indiana while speaking on the floor of this House used nearly the identical words and phrases that he uttered today. He told how the people had lost faith in the administration, that they did not want controls, that they wanted the free-enterprise system. I do not like to recall to the gentleman the result that was obtained in the election the following November.

I recognize the gentleman for his courage. He always has the courage to fight for the minorities. In his case the minorities are people with the views of the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Real Estate Board, the National Chamber of Commerce, and the Goulds and Rockefellers.

My distinguished colleague said that he resents the talk emanating from the administration that pressure is being used to defeat this measure. Surely, the gentleman must realize that we in this House are not so naive that we do not believe that some of the most powerful financial groups in this country are doing everything in their power to remove controls and to prohibit the strengthening of the existing regulations. Does he choose to completely ignore the great wave of pressure that is coming in favoring this legislation? Does he choose to ignore the pressure whose source is from the grass roots and the asphalt of our Nation? Because the people of the United States are speaking lucidly and forcefully on an issue that affects their every-day existence does he think that their plea and call should be ignored? The gentlemen should not look down on these people because they have not the media of the press, radio, and other facilities of public opinion at their command. He should not brush their thoughts aside because they are unable to write speeches for Congressmen to deliver upon this floor. He must realize that this is the voice of the people of our country who make the Government and who are the Government and who have a right to dictate the policies under which they desire to live. These are the people who are paying the bill. These are the people who—when they gather at the cross road, the street corner, the butcher shop, the grocery store—maintain that prices are entirely too high, that profits are too great, and that their dollar purchases too little. These are the people who have sent us here believing that it is a representative form of government and that we should speak for them and recognize their plight.

If the Republican Party desires inflation, excessive profits, and a higher cost of living the people will recognize the party's aims. If the Republican Party desires to see higher prices that have led to economic ruin in almost every European country they will continue to vote and speak as they have during the debate on this measure. If the gentleman from Indiana desires to once again make this the political issue of a campaign, we will gladly pick up the gauntlet and go to the people in the American way at election time, and I know that once again the people will recognize the inertia, disinterest, and lack of responsibility shown by that party, and will once again hand the reins of Government to the Democratic Party that is not afraid to fight the people's battle.

Let the gentleman from Indiana continue to give this type of leadership, and I can safely vouch for a Democratic administration for many years to come.

The other side of the aisle labels this legislation socialism and regimentation. During the 15 years that I have been in this House each measure that was

brought up on the floor for debate that benefited the mass of our people was sure to have the cry of socialism and regimentation thrown at it from the Republican side of this body. Fair wages and hours, social security, the strengthening of the workingman's compensation laws, and similar legislation was damned with the opprobrium of socialism.

If this measure before the House today, which is an attempt on the part of the Government to control gross profits and the high cost of living and make it possible for the workingman to feed his family, is termed socialism, I, for one, am not afraid to embrace it.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 2, after line 21, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No restriction, quota, or other limitation shall be placed upon the quantity of livestock which may be slaughtered or handled by any processor.'"

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same that was adopted by the Senate when it had the price-control bill under consideration recently. I am offering it believing that if it is adopted the people of this country will get more meat, which is what they want at the present time.

We heard some remarks on this floor yesterday that I think were more or less facetious, about people being compelled to eat horse meat. They are not going to be compelled to eat horse meat in this country if Mr. DiSalle will let them purchase and consume the beef, pork, lamb, and veal that is available. As a matter of fact, if Mr. DiSalle will not interfere too much we will have this year a supply of meat which will be greater per capita than we have ever had, with one or two exceptions. We will have about the same supply of beef that we had last year. We will have about the same supply of veal. We will have about 3½ pounds per capita more pork available. We will have about the same amount of lamb. Under the authority which the Director of Price Stabilization has asserted, by virtue of the provision in the law which gives the President power to make allocations of scarce materials, he has set up a system whereby every slaughterer must procure a slaughter quota before he can kill cattle or hogs. There are no price ceilings on hogs, nevertheless a slaughter quota has been put into effect as to hogs. Notwithstanding the fact that there are more cattle in this country this year than last the slaughter quota on cattle for the month of June was 80 percent of the number killed for the similar period a year ago. In July it has been raised to 90 percent.

In the case of hogs the June quota was 115 percent of a year ago. It has been reduced now to 105 percent of a year ago. That, of course, prevents the legitimate slaughterers of this country from slaughtering as much beef as they slaughtered a year ago, yet we have more beef on the hoof than we had a year ago. Slaughterers this month must slaughter

10 percent fewer hogs than they slaughtered last month because Mr. DiSalle says that that is the quota which will be permitted for this particular period.

We are told that these quotas were imposed to prevent black markets, but my question is: If that be the case and the legitimate slaughterers are permitted to purchase only a portion of the amount they purchased a year ago when there are more cattle and hogs now than then where is the extra supply going to go? I think the question is too obvious to need an answer, for if it goes to market, for there is only one place that it can go—the black market.

Farmers are opposed to these slaughtering quotas for several reasons. One is that they feel that it gives the packer a club over their head they would not have otherwise, because when there are more cattle or hogs on the market or more hogs on the market than the market can absorb or the packers can buy, all the packer has to do is to say: "I cannot buy any more today; I have bought my quota." Then he can go on and say: "I can buy on next week's quota, and I will take what you have left, but at a lower price," and they use that as a means of beating down the price. I do not say that every packer does it, but it is being done; and the result is that the farmer is forced to take a lower price than he would have to take in an unrestricted market.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Not long ago we had luncheon with the meat producers of my State. Their complaint was that while they have no objection to your fixing a price on what they can sell, they do object that there is no ceiling price on the producer of the beef; he can charge anything he wants. That day they said to us: "We are losing \$2 a head on the slaughter of hogs, and we are going to lose on beef." I think the price of beef is clear out of line at the present time, and I wish something could be done about it; but that is their complaint. Now, what are we going to do to correct that?

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I will tell you what Mr. DiSalle did; he did something very effective; he rolled back the price of the producer. That took about \$700,000,000 from the cattle producer and gave it to the packers and distributors. That is what Mr. DiSalle has done. So the difficulty the gentleman mentions may have been corrected to the satisfaction of his packers, although I may say that I do not know any meat producer, packer, or distributor who is satisfied with the program which Mr. DiSalle has inaugurated.

Mr. DONDERO. That was 3 weeks ago.

Mr. HOPE. Prices have been rolled back, and the packers have gotten the benefit of it.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has just discussed the effect of this quota system and has pointed out that when a producer brings his cattle into the market and the packers all say, "I have no quota," he is left without an adequate market. Is not that surplus which is left there in the market without a place to go the place from which the black market always gets its start? In other words, does not some black marketeer come along and buy those cattle that the packers cannot legitimately buy, take them out and slaughter them?

Mr. HOPE. That is the thing that is most likely to happen and it is what will happen if the legitimate slaughterers cannot buy them. The farmer will have to take his product home, or it will be purchased by someone without a quota.

I am opposed to this slaughter quota provision also for the additional reason that it discriminates against the little packers and those who have no history of having killed a uniform number of livestock per month. I recently talked to a man out in my town who runs a large food business, who slaughters part of his own beef. I asked him how this was affecting him. He said: "I cannot get a quota. I have always killed some beef. I have always bought some beef from the packers. I have done whatever I could do which was the best for my customers. If I could do better by buying from the packers I bought from the packers; if I could do better by buying at home and slaughtering, I would do that. But because a year ago I was not buying from the packers, I cannot get a slaughter quota. Based on 2 years ago I could. The result is I have to buy from the packers."

You see what that does to competition. It gives the big packers an unlimited market here without any competition from the little slaughterers in your community and mine. Its tendency will be to make big packers bigger and put small packers out of business.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. I find an inconsistency in the gentleman's explanation to our colleague from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. The little packers cannot get an allocation for slaughtering but will get this cattle that is fed into the black market. Is it better to have a restriction on all slaughtering if we want to avoid a black market?

Mr. HOPE. The people who do not have slaughter permits will be driven to the black market or out of business altogether.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman feels we would be better off if we kept that slaughterer out of the market or in the market?

Mr. HOPE. Let us have them all in without any restrictions, just as we had before the controls went into effect.

Then everybody will have an equal opportunity. The producer can sell his product, the packer can slaughter it, large or small, it will go on the market and we will get the full benefit of our large production of meat animals.

Mr. JAVITS. What the gentleman is saying in practical effect is you want no controls of any kind, either price or otherwise, and if you have no control over the slaughterers you would make price control easier?

Mr. HOPE. I do not think you would. The only outlet you have if the legitimate slaughterers cannot kill the beef is for it to go to the black markets. It is an encouragement to black marketing. There is no other conclusion that can be reached.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is not the nub of the gentleman's argument this: There are not enough slaughterers' permits being given? From the gentleman's argument, as I get it, apparently the Price Stabilizer is not allocating sufficient slaughtering permits to the small packer, is that true? And if that is true, why cannot sufficient permits be given to those people to prevent the cattle from going into the black market?

Mr. HOPE. I think they can. It would be of some assistance if the Price Stabilizer would issue a larger number of permits, and increase the percentage of livestock to something near the amount that is likely to come to market. But it all goes back to the fact that the Economic Stabilizer or Mr. DiSalle has to guess how many cattle are going to come to market and he fixes that as the quota. His guess may be good or it may be bad.

Mr. YATES. Will not those people who are in business and qualify as packers be able to get licenses to continue to slaughter?

Mr. HOPE. Some of them can and some cannot. But, suppose they do get them, if they can only kill 90 percent of what they did a year ago, although there are more cattle in the country now than then.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think perhaps I can help explain the situation that the gentleman from Kansas is attempting to call to the attention of the House by telling the House of an incident in my own district, in the city of Bellefontaine, Logan County, Ohio, which is a city of about 12,000; the county seat of a rural county, in which there was a little slaughtering plant that had been in operation a number

of years, but the conditions in that slaughtering plant were not up to modern standards, sanitation and all. So, the farm leaders of that county and community and some of the civic leaders got together and purchased the plant last year and spent about 7 months in modernizing the plant. When they were ready to open they were told by the officials in the regional office in Cleveland, Ohio, to go ahead with their normal slaughtering and a permit would be issued later. However, when the permit came along the number of animals they were permitted to slaughter was based not on the entire year of 1950, but on what had been slaughtered in the old plant in a little over 3 months, so that they could not operate at a profit. After weeks of discussion with everybody—this man Leach that you have in OPS, Mike DiSalle and others—a ruling was finally made despite the orders of the regional office, that they had to be bound by the 3 months' limit, and then cut by 80 percent, and the result is that that little packing plant has been closed and the local meat markets are unable to get their meat supply locally, and they have to depend on these outside packers. Now that is the situation up there, and that is an outrage.

Mr. HOPE. Well, there are many similar instances, and there are many cases where a small packer, who is running on a pretty close margin anyway, cannot operate under an 80- or 90-percent allocation. He makes his profit out of the last 10 or 20 percent of his slaughter.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It is not only the slaughtering quotas, but the grading regulations in the small communities, along with other things, that are making it almost impossible for the small butcher-slaughtering to operate.

Mr. HOPE. That is true. There is hardly a regulation issued by Mr. DiSalle that does not have the direct or indirect effect of reducing the meat supply of this country.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is not only the lack of license and the regulations, but the cost of the graders themselves in the small plants, particularly in the rural districts, where they have to travel miles and be paid for it that makes it impossible for the small plants to operate.

Mr. HOPE. Yes, and that contributes to the closing of many small plants. There is no question about that.

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

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

Mr. GAMBLE. The packers in addition to having a quota for the month, must buy at an average price for that month which is not over the ceiling price. Is it not a fact that the packers are afraid to buy at the prevailing price at the beginning of the month which might be over the ceiling without know-

ing whether they can buy at a lower price later on in the month and maintain their average price not over the ceiling?

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. GAMBLE. And he would be penalized if his average price is over the ceiling.

Mr. HOPE. That has the effect of reducing the price to the producer because of the caution which the slaughterer must exercise in making his purchases during the early part of the month.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. There is a situation even worse than any that has been mentioned so far. In Bloomington, Ind., there is a packer, the Bloomington Frosted Food Locker Co., Inc., that provided the university dining rooms there with a certain type of meat to meet their needs. Prior to 1948 they had built as fine a packing plant as there is in the country for its size. In 1948 they entered into an agreement with some other packers whereby they were to do the buying from them and do the processing of the meat themselves. That worked out very well until this present emergency came about, and they have been unable to buy the beef that they must have. They are not in the black market; they are absolutely reliable, and the meat section of OPS here agreed to that, but they said, "We absolutely cannot allow anyone to start butchering that has not done so in 1950." I said, "Do you mean to say the situation is now that no one can start another packing plant in America?" They said, "That is exactly what we mean." Unless this amendment goes through, that is exactly the situation we are going to have. That is absolutely un-American.

Mr. HOPE. That means that everyone has to get a license because that is what a quota amounts to. Mr. DiSalle suggested awhile ago that he wanted to license all business and you know what a storm that caused. He has already licensed the packing business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. The statement has been made to the effect that if quotas on slaughtering are prevented black markets will be encouraged and will flourish. Has anyone in Mr. DiSalle's office given our committee any satisfactory proof of the fact that this quota provision is calculated to control black markets?

Mr. HOPE. We have asked the question, of course, in the committee and at other times of Mr. DiSalle and other people from his organization. They always beat around the bush and do not come up with any direct answer. That has been the experience we have had. They have, I think, to a certain extent let the cat out of the bag when they say that it is a lot easier to convict a man

of violating a slaughtering quota than it is to convict him of selling meat above ceiling prices. In other words they want it as a punitive measure.

Mr. COOLEY. But they lose complete sight of the fact that black-market meat does not necessarily have to go to the slaughter house at all. It can be slaughtered in the woods, on the creeks, behind trees, and in barns.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. For that reason, I do not think the reason they give gets to the real black-market situation.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it possible, in the gentleman's opinion, to have a price-control system on livestock without having such a quota and slaughtering regulation?

Mr. HOPE. I will have to answer the gentleman this way: I do not believe you can successfully maintain price controls on beef under any circumstances. I do not think it can be done. I think that any attempt to do so will in the end result in failure. It will result in less meat, it will result in black markets, it will result in law violations of all kinds. I believe that will be the experience we will have under this program, no matter what we do here or do not do here, just as it was the experience we had under the program during World War II.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Is not what the gentleman from North Carolina said getting down to this, that if the slaughterer is not licensed then if he sells on the black market he is guilty of only one crime, he has sold on the black market and broken the price ceiling, but on the other hand, if he has to be licensed he is guilty of two violations, he is doing it without a license and he is also selling over the ceiling price. Therefore, are not we in the cities better off to have him licensed?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not have any objection to the licensing aspects of it, it is the limitation of the quota. Certainly you can license a slaughterer. I assume that most reputable slaughterers are licensed. The gentleman knows pretty well that the big packers are not going to violate this law, the violations are going to be by the fly-by-night black-market racketeers.

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

Mr. Chairman, there has been much confusion about slaughtering quotas. The facts are very simple. The expected supply of meat for any month is distributed among the regular slaughterers in proportion to the amount they slaughtered in 1950. It is, in fact, following precisely the provisions of section 701 (c) of the act which calls for making materials available to businesses in the normal channel of distribution on the basis of their historical consumption.

The computation starts with a known factor, the number of meat animals of various kinds which were slaughtered each month in 1950. Each month OPS, in cooperation with the Department of

Agriculture and the industry, makes an estimate of the number of cattle, hogs and other kinds of animals which the farmers will send to the market for slaughter each month. If OPS estimates that the same number of cattle or hogs will be sent to market as were slaughtered during the same month last year, a quota of 100 percent would be assigned to each slaughterer. If the estimate is that only 50 percent as many will be sent to market as were slaughtered during the same month last year, then quotas of 50 percent would be assigned. By the same token, if the estimate is that twice as many animals will be sent to market during the coming month, then a quota of 200 percent would be assigned.

If more animals are sent to market than expected, the quotas are increased accordingly. In other words, the quota is based solely on the relation between the supply for the month and the number of animals slaughtered during the same month last year.

In May the following quotas were assigned:

	Percent
Cattle	90
Calves	87
Sheep and lambs	87
Hogs	110

For June the quotas assigned were:

	Percent
Cattle	80
Calves	80
Sheep and lambs	80
Hogs	115

For July the quotas are:

	Percent
Cattle	90
Calves	85
Sheep and lambs	85
Hogs	105

By this method, all the cattle sent to market are channeled to the normal distributors through the normal channels of distribution, and consumers are able to buy their normal amount of meat at their usual places of supply.

WILL ESTABLISH CHAOS

Ordinarily I would not be in favor of freezing anything in the normal channels of trade and distribution which might prevent or hinder or retard or act as a deterrent to some person going into that same business, but we are in an emergency now which of course makes us do things which we would not ordinarily do. I do believe it is in the interest of the country and in the interest of the people to channel the meat supply through the normal distributors, the slaughterers and the wholesaler and retailer. Then the people can go to the places that they normally go to purchase their meat and purchase it there. I am afraid the gentleman's amendment would establish chaos in the industry.

Then, instead of the normal channels of trade and distribution handling the meat it would go through the black market. This is to stop the black market. Certainly we should not encourage it, but stop it as much as possible. The black marketeer would slaughter the animals. He would not be under any quotas. The animals would not go through the normal channels of trade because we have experienced that. They

would go out through a different channel of trade and distribution and you would not get your meat at the grocery store where you normally get it, because it will be diverted. It could not go over through those normal slaughterers as before; and it would not go through the same wholesaler and the same distributors, but will be diverted. Therefore, there would be chaos in the meat industry.

I think it is in the interest of the people and in the interest of the national defense effort that we channel this meat supply, which, of course, will be scarce, through the normal channels of trade.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. In doing that, the people in the areas which do not have a meat supply will have an opportunity to get meat just as they are getting it now. It is more or less frozen in that situation. But if you have chaos, with the black marketeers taking over, butchering the animals back of the barn somewhere, thereby causing all of that waste with which you are acquainted, diverting it from normal channels, the areas where they do not produce meat will not receive their fair share for the people.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Suppose the gentleman had a hundred head of steers on feed today and he would have them ready for market in October, and he ran into an 80-percent slaughter quota, the packer refused to buy, or any other legitimate dealer refused to buy, what would the gentleman from Texas do then?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about an exceptional case.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, it is. That can be provided for easily. That is not new. That has come up before. It was handled under the hardship clause, just as the case mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. If they do not handle it properly, it is the fault of the Administrator. Let us not be at fault ourselves. Let us give them the power to do it and expect them to do it discreetly. If they do not do it, we cannot help it, but we will give them the power and iron out such cases as that, adjust the hardship cases later on.

Mr. GROSS. What power are you going to give them?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going to be diverted on any such detail. That is just incidental. There are many things in the country that there is no way to handle. Controls happen to be one of them. Relief is another. There is no satisfactory way to administer relief. We have got to provide the best law we can and give the administrators the power to properly administer it, to make adjustments, to correct inequalities and

hardships, and then they will be obligated to properly enforce it.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I notice the comment of the gentleman from Texas, in answer to the question put by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], with reference to the steers. I happen to represent the great State of Idaho where we have not only a lot of cattle but a lot of sheep. Most of the land out there still belongs to the Federal Government. The Federal Government says how many sheep we can graze on that land. This year we have an unusually heavy lamb crop, a larger percentage of the lambs.

Mr. PATMAN. Now I yielded for a question, if you please.

Mr. BUDGE. This lamb crop this year was exceptionally heavy, due to the fact that there were a lot of doubles. It is almost a hundred percent larger lamb crop, much bigger than last year. What does the gentleman from Texas expect us to do with the lambs left over after 80 percent of them have been slaughtered?

Mr. PATMAN. Now we are talking about quotas.

Mr. BUDGE. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. PATMAN. If you raise a lot more sheep and lambs in Idaho you will have to increase the quotas. In other words, if they raised twice as many, the quota will be 200 percent. If they raised three times as many, the quota will be 300 percent. That will be easily adjusted.

Mr. BUDGE. One more question, please.

Mr. PATMAN. Just a question now.

Mr. BUDGE. In the gentleman's opinion, are we not going back to the Wallace theory of plowing under little pigs?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I do not think so. I do not think we are going in that direction at all.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. You just pick that up next month; adjust the quota that way.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I thought I explained that.

Now, I do not believe the other body would have placed in this bill many of the amendments they did if they had entertained the idea that the same identical amendments would be accepted over here, because that means they are out of conference. You know how that body acts. They just say, "We will send it to conference. We will just vote for it and send it to conference"; but if we adopt the policy of adopting the identical language like this, the other body having adopted this identical language, then it is not in conference, and there is no way to change it. I do not care how harmful it may be, it is cemented in the bill. There is no way to change it. I respectfully suggest that the best thing to do is certainly not to adopt this in the identical language, so as to take

it out of the area of disagreement, but to leave it as it is, defeat the amendment, and then it will be in conference. If it is a good thing, the conferees can agree to it. This amendment will place the handcuffs on the administration. Mr. Charles E. Wilson made a wonderful speech last night. I hope those who did not hear it will read it. It had the ring of sincerity that could only come from an honest, God-fearing American.

DON'T PASS THE BUCK—MAKE IT WORTH A DOLLAR

Mr. BARRETT. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, when a workman in my district in Philadelphia goes into a store and finds that a pair of workshoes that used to cost him \$6.98 a year ago now has on it a price tag of \$8.65, he does not understand what is going on down here. He reads in the papers that inflation is supposed to be over, and that we do not need price controls.

"What would the price of those shoes be without price controls?" he wants to know. And he wants to know: "When are we going to get the kind of price controls that will get prices down where they belong?"

I have just recently had the honor and privilege of being appointed to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, and have had the privilege of joining in the committee's deliberations on the Defense Production Act which contains the price control law. This enabled me to bring directly before this committee the protests of thousands of my constituents, whom I personally interviewed, against rising prices and demanding strong price controls. But while I am new to this committee, I want to admonish the members of the great need for legislation of this type.

I do not find it hard to think back to a period 5 years ago, on this very House floor, just exactly 5 years ago in June of 1946, when we had before us another bill dealing with price control. That was during my first term in the Congress and there were many speeches on the House floor by Members who had served here for long periods and were regarded as experts on this kind of legislation.

I listened carefully to those experienced Members as they discussed the OPA. It was my own belief then based on my own background and experience among the working people of Philadelphia, that we needed price controls in 1946 and needed them very badly. I so voted. I opposed all of the amendments to cripple OPA and kill effective price control. My side lost. We were outvoted by those who assured us they had the real answer to all of the Nation's problems and that it was a very simple answer: Just get rid of OPA.

There was a big advertisement running in the newspapers in those days. It said: "Would you like some butter or a roast of beef?" It says OPA means low production, low production means black mar-

kets, black markets mean needlessly high prices.

This ad ran in the Washington Post on May 4, 1946. Ads like it ran in newspapers all over the country. They were paid for by the National Association of Manufacturers—which, by the way, never registered under the lobbying act because it claims it does not engage in lobbying activities.

This ad and others like it and the many millions big business spent in 1946 to stampede the Congress and the people had a lot to do with killing price control in 1946. When the people woke up to what had hit them, it was too late. The cost of living had gone up so fast that millions of wage earners were priced right out of the market, and they never did catch up again on their standard of living for years afterward. As soon as they did start to catch up, and could live fairly decently, along came this inflation last June and took the food right out of their mouths.

Well, we finally got price controls on again and stopped the price rush. Hamburger costs 68 or 70 cents a pound now instead of 55; a quart of milk in Philadelphia is up from 19 to 22 cents or so; a suit of clothes that used to cost \$39.25 in Philadelphia a year ago now costs \$45; rents are up, baby food went up and so did just about everything else, but at least we finally stopped them from going any higher. We are groggy from the beating this inflation gave us, but at least we worked our way out of the windmill of punches and we are getting a chance to catch our breath.

And now the National Association of Manufacturers in trying to talk the Congress into doing the same thing it talked the Seventy-ninth Congress into doing 5 years ago last month, right here on this floor—that is, kill price control and let the profiteers loose again.

Mr. Chairman, we just cannot permit it to happen. We learned our lesson the hard way 5 years ago. We saw our people suffer. We saw mothers forced to cut down on the milk they could buy for their children. We saw kids running around in tatters because clothing cost so much. We saw our constituents lose faith in the Congress—and that is a terrible thing to have happen.

This bill on price control which has come out of the Banking and Currency Committee is not a strong enough bill. It says to the American people that beef is just for the rich and that the poor shall not be enabled to buy it. They must eat something else. We have more beef cattle than we ever had in this country before, and the farmer is making this year probably more money in net income than he ever made—farm income this year will probably be greater even than it was in the peak year of 1947—and yet we are told in this bill that there can be no roll-back on beef prices for the consumer. The roll-back that benefited the packers—that was different. This bill does not touch that. But the roll-backs to benefit the consumer, they are out.

Mr. Chairman, I voted to give the consumer, the workman, the housewife, the break on roll-backs. Meat prices are too high. They must be reduced. This

bill must be amended to reduce meat prices to the consumer. The cattle raiser is doing all right and the roll-back will not ruin them at all.

Between the NAM lobby trying to kill price control and the beef lobby trying to kill the roll-backs on meat prices for the consumer, the Congress is getting the business. But it is bad business, Mr. Chairman. It is not right.

We have the chance here on this bill to show our people that we are working for them and voting in their interest and not for the special interests and the big business interests and the Beef Trust. The people of Philadelphia know that the Democratic administration is in their corner and fighting for them on this issue. Philadelphia is going to go Democratic this year and elect a Democratic city administration for the first time in generations because it has learned that the Democrats on an issue which means decent living standards for the people can be counted on to do the right thing.

But we Democrats are not selfish on things like this. The Republicans in the Congress are invited to join with us in putting through a good bill, and thus helping to redeem their party a little in the eyes of the people.

So here is the chance, Mr. Chairman, for all Members of Congress to show that we are not going to pass the buck—we are going to make it worth a dollar—a hundred cents' worth of purchasing power again.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if you want chaos in the cattle industry the surest way to have it is to have the quota system. I represent the second largest livestock market in America, at Omaha, Nebr. Here is how those quotas would operate in that market:

If in June 100,000 cattle come to the Omaha market and that is the amount Omaha slaughtered last year, this year they can buy only 80 percent of that number. The other 20,000 that have come to our market must go back to the farm or some questionable purchaser has to buy them.

That is the only way on earth the farmer can get rid of those cattle. If you want to guarantee a black market the surest way on earth to do it is to set quotas and to have quotas that are less than the supply.

Here is what happened in the last war under a similar situation: A friend of mine brought cattle to south Omaha on one of the big market days. He had his cattle in the pens and went over to the livestock exchange to get his dinner. There was no meat on the menu; he could not get meat to eat. He went back to the livestock pens after he had his dinner and asked how much they had sold his cattle for. They replied: "We have not been able to sell them on account of the quotas." So here was a fellow with thousands of pounds of beef on the hoof right in the stockyards ready to sell and yet he could not buy a meat course in the livestock restaurant 200 feet away because quotas had prevented the packers from buying the meat.

That was the time when black markets ran wild. We had a report in the committee in 1945 from the Secretary of the New York State Food Merchants' Association, who had collected facts from 4,500-odd dealers. He reported to our committee that 53 percent of the meat coming through the retail New York market of his association were coming from black markets. That is what the situation will be under quotas.

In the last war, Safeway Stores, one of the biggest food merchants in the United States, had to buy eight packing plants in order to get meat. The quotas were making it impossible for the normal suppliers, the normal processors, to get the supply of cattle that they normally processed in their plants. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that if you want to have black markets keep having quotas and I will guarantee that you will have black markets.

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

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take the case of the Safeway Stores; they had to purchase this line of packing plants not so much in order to get all the meat they wanted but in order to get a constant flow of some meat. Is that correct or not?

Mr. BUFFETT. That is largely correct; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Because if the quota prevented them from slaughtering the meat that they need to supply their own retail customers, then it prevented their attaining the big objective, that is, not having all the meat they wanted, but to have a constant flow of meat, a narrow stream or wide stream, a constant flow; they had to acquire those packing plants.

Mr. BUFFETT. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what they are up against now. May I ask the gentleman this question? Under the present situation is this 80 percent order established in advance of the beginning of the month in which it applies?

Mr. BUFFETT. As I understand it, it is established in advance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that is correct and I bring my livestock either to a small auction market or to a market like Omaha, and before they dispose of my cattle the quota has been filled, what do you expect me to do with those cattle?

Mr. BUFFETT. You are certainly up against it; you have got to sell your cattle in the black market.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am asking the gentleman a plain question.

Mr. BUFFETT. You would have to find a buyer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, a buyer anywhere I can find a buyer.

Mr. BUFFETT. You have no choice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right, I have no choice. And does the gentleman think the men who live and work 12, 14, or 18 hours a day on the farms and ranches are going to submit to that kind of program in this country?

Mr. BUFFETT. No, sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, they are not. They will sell to black market or

otherwise. We ought to have sense enough to know that, too.

Mr. BUFFETT. When cattle are ready for market, they are like watermelons, you have to market them.

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

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. If it is true he has to bring these cattle to market, why, then, did we have such a shortage of cattle coming to the market within the last few months?

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman mean the temporary shortage for several weeks?

Mr. YATES. Correct.

Mr. BUFFETT. I understand the greater part of that shortage was due to the fact that when the roll-backs were announced a lot of people marketed half-finished cattle. They marketed them ahead of the roll-back and quotas, so that after the quotas were put in there were a small number of cattle in the market for some period of time. If the gentleman has a better answer than that, I would like to have it.

Mr. YATES. I have an answer that I have seen in the newspapers; that is, perhaps it was to the best interest of those who raise the cattle not to bring them to market at that particular time in the hope that amendments such as this would be presented and there would be no ceilings on beef or livestock at all.

Mr. BUFFETT. I suggest to the gentleman he might find that an easy way to go broke is to keep cattle in a feeding lot after they are finished and ready for market. If the gentleman does not believe that, try it sometime.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to answer the question asked a moment ago by the gentleman from Illinois of the gentleman from Nebraska. Here is the answer, and, incidentally, this is one chamber of commerce that is not against controls but for controls. I quote from a letter I received from the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce:

Our local butchers inform us that shortages are caused by the cattle raisers who are holding up shipments to the markets for higher prices. The retailers are incensed at the methods being used by the wholesalers who have created a black market such as we have never seen before. Butchers are compelled to accept tie-in sales. For a certain amount of inferior grades of meat they must take a box of hams, eggs, butter, etc. If they want choice grades they have to pay in cash all the way down the line in addition to outrageously high prices for the meat and short weight, etc. There are many other disgraceful means of cheating by the black marketeers, meaning the wholesalers, too numerous to mention here.

That is the answer.

To you farmers from Idaho and Nebraska, let me say that I am a Representative of the State of New York. The State of New York raises as much cattle and sells as much livestock and livestock products as 10 other States together, four and a half times as much as Idaho, and almost as much as Nebraska, and

the livestock raisers and producers in my State are not crying the way you gentlemen are.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman explain this point that has just been made about licensing? Is there any control over slaughterers unless this quota provision is in effect?

Mr. MULTER. None whatsoever.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, they are not licensed at all? This is the only way to control them if you want to avoid black marketing?

Mr. MULTER. You cannot control them without quota regulations. To you farmers who want to protect the little fellow, let me tell you this, and you can read it in the regulations if you want to read because I do know you can read, even though you do not interpret correctly what you read:

Any farmer may slaughter up to 6,000 pounds of livestock a year and freely dispose of it any way he pleases.

There is no quota regulation against them, there is no other regulation against them. That has been traditional in the industry and the OPS and Mr. DiSalle have not tried to change it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sure that the gentleman, while he is probably quite capable of doing so, does not want to give the House the impression that he represents the State of New York? There are a few others of us here from New York who would like to be recognized also.

Mr. MULTER. I am sorry I gave that impression. I am only 1 of 45 Representatives from the State of New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Quite so, and I am sure the gentleman also does not want to give the impression that all the Representatives from the State of New York take exception in a rather—well, let us say, violent way with the farmers of the great West. I do not think that is entirely correct.

Mr. MULTER. No. I am quite sure you and I agree that New York produces more than 15 percent of the taxes and income in this country and has always helped the rest of the country, and will continue to do so.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Certainly, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. TALLE. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman, but I gathered from what he said in the early part of his speech that the State of New York produced more livestock than any other 12 States of the Union. Reference was made to Idaho and Nebraska specifically. Now, coming as I do from the State of Iowa, and knowing something about what we produce, I am interested in having the gentleman check his figures so that the Members of the House may have accurate information.

Mr. MULTER. The State of New York is the twelfth highest State of the Union in producing livestock and livestock products.

Mr. TALLE. That is quite a different thing from saying that the State of New York produces as much as any other 12 States put together.

Mr. MULTER. For your edification let me say this. Did the gentleman refer to Iowa?

Mr. TALLE. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Iowa produces three times as much as the State of New York.

Mr. TALLE. That is fine.

Mr. MULTER. And the State of New York produces four and a half times as much as the State of Idaho.

Mr. TALLE. Now we are getting nearer to the truth. Let us have something about Texas and Florida.

Mr. MULTER. All right, let us take the State of Florida. We will find it here. Florida produces less than one-fifth of that produced by New York State.

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot let this moment go by without saying that we heard a lot of pleas earlier in the debate that we ought to approach this Defense Production Act on a nonpartisan basis; that it is not a political issue; that it is a matter of the national interest and the national security. Well, to emphasize that, you were privileged a while ago to hear the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] deliver his campaign speech of 1952. We boys on our side are ready to slug it out with you now if you are ready to start the campaign. We will take the issue you are giving to us. In the French Revolution it was "Let them eat cake," and now you are saying "let them eat pork, if they cannot buy steak." We will meet that issue. One of our colleagues said the farmer was told he should know on what side his bread is buttered. Do not overlook the farmer who was asked: "Who are you going to vote for in 1952—" and the farmer responded, "Well, I voted for Dewey twice, and I have never been so well off."

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman gave some figures on livestock production in New York compared to Nebraska. To retrieve the honors of Nebraska, will you give us the comparative figures for Nebraska and New York?

Mr. MULTER. Gentleman, I am not going to take my time answering all of those questions for you now, but I will tell you what I will do. As soon as we go back into the House I will ask for permission to put in the RECORD the complete statement of the 48 States as given to us in the bulletin, Farm Income, released June 27, 1951, by the Department of Agriculture, and I am sure you will not dispute the figures.

Mr. BUFFETT. Quote the figures in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER. I am quoting them correctly and you can compare them and then tomorrow you can read them for yourselves. You should know them before you attempt to make these arguments.

The figures are as follows:

TABLE 4.—Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, January–April 1950–51

[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	Livestock and products		Crops		Total	
	1950 ¹	1951 ¹	1950	1951	1950 ²	1951 ²
Maine.....	23,136	28,319	43,541	35,643	66,677	63,962
New Hampshire.....	13,730	17,333	4,568	4,855	18,298	22,188
Vermont.....	24,495	32,402	7,790	7,783	32,285	40,185
Massachusetts.....	33,517	42,427	16,981	16,058	50,498	58,485
Rhode Island.....	4,596	5,405	1,513	1,554	6,109	6,959
Connecticut.....	27,174	34,446	25,693	21,875	52,867	56,321
New York.....	170,062	214,425	57,256	59,314	227,318	273,739
New Jersey.....	52,245	69,710	14,112	15,118	66,357	84,828
Pennsylvania.....	165,550	210,767	54,685	58,024	220,235	268,791
North Atlantic region.....	514,505	655,234	226,139	220,224	740,644	875,458
Ohio.....	187,482	252,813	69,446	68,585	256,928	321,398
Indiana.....	201,448	273,466	67,714	64,948	269,162	328,414
Illinois.....	317,556	425,291	213,766	172,011	531,322	597,302
Michigan.....	119,424	154,537	61,796	54,277	181,220	208,814
Wisconsin.....	256,424	334,923	34,090	32,842	290,514	367,765
East North Central region.....	1,082,334	1,441,030	446,812	382,663	1,529,146	1,823,663
Minnesota.....	260,476	345,043	92,222	64,677	352,698	409,720
Iowa.....	511,994	694,133	129,518	96,895	641,512	791,028
Missouri.....	203,805	268,742	37,017	50,398	240,822	319,140
North Dakota.....	31,194	39,565	54,409	74,914	85,603	114,479
South Dakota.....	94,823	127,175	32,031	38,280	126,854	165,455
Nebraska.....	191,497	257,867	86,848	105,036	278,345	362,903
Kansas.....	188,022	251,965	92,027	59,542	280,049	311,507
West North Central region.....	1,481,811	1,984,490	524,072	489,742	2,005,883	2,474,232

¹ Revised.

² Includes revision for livestock and products.

TABLE 4.—Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, January-April 1950-51—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	Livestock and products		Crops		Total		State and region	Livestock and products		Crops		Total	
	1950 ¹	1951 ¹	1950	1951	1950 ²	1951 ²		1950 ¹	1951 ¹	1950	1951	1950 ²	1951 ²
Delaware.....	24,685	30,105	1,947	2,823	26,632	32,928	Texas.....	247,756	325,355	256,420	142,457	504,176	467,812
Maryland.....	47,713	58,334	8,451	9,614	56,164	67,948	South Central region.....	606,222	781,851	596,911	505,750	1,203,133	1,287,601
Virginia.....	57,390	72,880	39,726	43,773	97,116	116,653	Montana.....	30,911	41,445	31,657	50,512	62,568	91,957
West Virginia.....	21,098	25,476	6,192	7,874	27,290	33,350	Idaho.....	38,098	49,378	43,591	46,389	81,689	95,767
North Carolina.....	40,432	50,660	33,205	36,782	73,637	87,442	Wyoming.....	13,658	19,710	6,694	7,077	20,352	26,787
South Carolina.....	19,230	24,657	14,988	18,019	34,218	42,676	Colorado.....	88,558	111,105	49,463	44,027	138,021	155,132
Georgia.....	56,571	71,824	24,721	33,898	81,292	105,722	New Mexico.....	23,058	29,795	15,635	16,338	38,693	46,133
Florida.....	32,809	38,307	177,626	179,269	210,435	217,606	Arizona.....	25,078	31,131	46,781	64,492	71,859	95,623
South Atlantic region.....	299,928	372,243	306,856	332,082	606,784	704,325	Utah.....	28,846	37,479	7,607	7,935	36,453	45,414
Kentucky.....	67,681	88,510	112,639	92,719	180,320	181,229	Nevada.....	10,205	13,774	1,622	2,570	11,827	16,344
Tennessee.....	56,246	72,232	50,383	55,590	106,629	127,822	Washington.....	50,547	62,220	56,571	61,931	107,118	124,151
Alabama.....	37,014	45,749	18,523	29,950	55,537	75,699	Oregon.....	42,465	53,967	28,849	21,515	71,314	75,482
Mississippi.....	32,303	39,616	27,415	66,495	59,718	106,111	California.....	232,443	295,445	204,915	255,930	437,358	551,375
Arkansas.....	44,865	57,130	36,928	57,134	81,793	114,264	Western region.....	583,867	745,449	493,385	578,716	1,077,252	1,324,165
Louisiana.....	29,869	36,234	36,683	41,978	66,552	78,212	United States.....	4,568,667	5,980,297	2,594,175	2,509,177	7,162,842	8,489,474
Oklahoma.....	90,488	117,025	57,920	19,427	148,408	136,452							

¹ Revised.

² Includes revision for livestock and products.

Now, let us get this quota business straight. I told you that any farmer can slaughter up to 6,000 pounds of meat a year and dispose of it freely where, when, and as he pleases. Any slaughterer who slaughters up to ten head of cattle a month is free of these quota restrictions. Do not come in here telling us how the little farmer is crying, that he needs some help. These restrictions are aimed at the big black marketeers, the big packers, who supported and financed this entire phony baloney campaign.

This quota system is not what its antagonists pretend it is. Under this quota system the Department of Agriculture determines "What did the packing houses slaughter last year?" Not the farmer, not the feeder, not the cattle raiser, but what did the slaughterer slaughter last year? Then they estimate how many cattle are coming to market today. Then OPS gives you the quota based on that. If the amount of cattle coming to market today is in excess of what it was then by 10 percent, the slaughtering quota is increased 10 percent. The idea is not to stop the farmer, not to stop the cattle raiser, not to stop the feeder, but to see to it that these cattle are channelled in to the licensed slaughterers and do not get into the black market.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Will the gentleman include in the RECORD the amount contributed by the State of New York to the Federal Government which helps support the farmers throughout the Nation?

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman will agree it is about 15 percent of the over-all national income. Is not that about right?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Yes; I believe that is the amount.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman referred to the regulation that now allows any individual to slaughter up to 6,000

pounds for his own use, also to the regulation that allows a minimum of slaughtering by a commercial slaughterer, without regard to any quota. Can the gentleman give us some assurance that if this law is passed as it is now written without any amendment, 2 months or 3 months or a year from now we will still have those same exemptions in the regulations? I understand they are regulations only and not statutory law, and that they are subject to change any day that Mr. DiSalle sees fit to change them. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that he is going to keep those regulations in effect? Can he tell us what we will have to do to keep them in effect, if we do not adopt an amendment to do it?

Mr. MULTER. If we are going to try to do more than lay down in the law the principles instead of leaving to the Department the regulation, we had better make up our minds that from here on in we are going to be a regulatory body and not a Congress. Your assurance that these regulations are going to continue to be reasonable, and reasonably enforced, is that we have reasonable-minded men in Government, and we are calling upon reasonably-minded men to try to do an honest-to-goodness job so as to protect your security and my security, the security of this country.

Now and then, here and there, we will get a man who will not do that, but I am sure we will remove him before he can do any damage. Your best assurance of future reasonableness is past reasonableness.

My experience with that man who has been so harshly and unjustly abused, Mr. DiSalle, is that he is reasonable, he is fair, he is honest, and he is decent. Any time anyone comes in and says, "This is my problem," he will sit down and go over it with him and help him if he is entitled to help.

Bear this in mind when we are talking about the quota regulation, that he can change the quota the very day it is established. If the estimate calls for a regulation that fixes it at 105 percent and actual marketing conditions show it should be 110, he can change it in 24 hours or less. He said so to the Commit-

tee on Agriculture. When conditions require the quota to be changed, he can and does change it on short notice.

Mr. POAGE. I read in this morning's paper, whether it is correct or not, that more cattle were coming to market now than at this time a year ago. I believe the gentleman read just a moment ago that the present quota on cattle is 90 percent.

Mr. MULTER. No, I did not read that.

Mr. POAGE. What is it, then?

Mr. MULTER. I cannot tell the gentleman at the moment.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Texas read it, then, but the gentleman will agree it is 90 percent?

Mr. MULTER. No, I do not know what it is.

Mr. POAGE. What is it today? I am asking the gentleman, what is the quota right today?

Mr. MULTER. I refuse to yield any further. It is of no importance. No one has dared stand up here and say it is wrong. You make an argument based on supposition and imagination.

The fact of the matter is that if cattle coming to market are 10 percent over a year ago, the quota is 10 percent over a year ago for slaughtering.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. Is it not true that we cannot have legislation of this type if we do not have flexible regulations to meet conditions that change practically every day?

Mr. MULTER. There is no doubt about it. Conditions change, and we have to meet the existing situation.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Will you explain why it is that if the number of cattle to be slaughtered is reduced because of the quota that that will make the price of meat cheaper to the consumer?

Mr. MULTER. The quota system is not intended to cheapen the price of

meat. Do not confuse allocations and priorities with price control. Let us keep the record clear.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. All right then, what is it for?

Mr. MULTER. The quota system is intended to keep the black marketeer out. It is intended to see that the cattle that you send and your farmers send to market reach the legitimate slaughterer and no one else.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. But you are restricting the number that the legitimate slaughterer can slaughter.

Mr. MULTER. We are restricting the number that he slaughters in accordance with the number that comes to market and the restriction is only for the purpose of allocating the cattle that come to market amongst the legitimate slaughterers and nothing else, and you cannot read anything else into that regulation.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. You do agree it raises the price, do you not?

Mr. MULTER. It does not raise the price. I do not agree.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Reference was made before to the statement that the 1952 campaign issue will be based upon the packers' statement, "Let them eat pork"; I think the gentleman should make some correction in the RECORD so far as those of us are concerned who do not eat pork. What are we going to do?

Mr. MULTER. If this amendment prevails, we are all going to become vegetarians, whether we like it or not.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Your own mayor of New York, Mr. O'Dwyer, when the OPA was in effect in 1946, wired an urgent wire to the President asking him to take off controls so that the people in New York could get a little beef. You are following the same pattern here.

Mr. MULTER. No; we are not. You are.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What will you do just before the election in 1952?

Mr. MULTER. We are not following that pattern. You are following that same pattern. You are voting to take controls off. We learn by our mistakes, but you do not want to learn.

You are saying to take these controls off. You want to kill this control bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What will you be doing in 1952 before the election?

Mr. MULTER. You will be begging for these controls. I will say this, too, even though the President said last year he did not want these price controls, at that time the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Democrats on this side of the House voted them, with the help of some of you men, as standby controls. You can ignore the best interests of your country and of your constituents now. They will know how to respond in 1952.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Hope amendment and all amendments thereto close at 15 minutes to 5.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, can the Chair advise us how many Members are standing, indicating that they would like to be heard on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes 37 or 38 Members.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Hope amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, by unanimous consent we just allowed one member of the committee 15 or 20 minutes to argue one side of this amendment. I do not think it is fair to ask 45 or 50 people to be satisfied with three-quarters of a minute each to express some ideas that they might have on this, and therefore I will have to object to that request.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Hope amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 15 minutes after 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE), there were—ayes 110, noes 45.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. POULSON, and Mr. GROSS yielded the time allotted to them to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for yielding me the time allotted to them. I now have 4½ or 6 minutes. The gentleman from New York who preceded me [Mr. MULTER] has just consumed about 20 minutes. Unfortunately, the gentleman from the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., is not familiar, from a practical viewpoint, as he might be with this problem.

The gentleman from New York at the close of his remarks did make a rather interesting observation when he said Mr. DiSalle under this bill could change the rules, orders, and regulations with respect to quotas on livestock at any time he may choose to do so. Of course, since he can do that to quotas he can do it with regard to other regulations. In other words, you would leave it to the head of a bureau to determine how many cattle, hogs, sheep, and other animals may, or may not, be sold in the market during any period of time.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has pointed out, for example, that Mr. DiSalle decided the number of cattle that could be slaughtered during April of this year should be 80 percent of what the same slaughterers processed in the same month last year. On hogs I think it was 90 percent, and on sheep

80 or 90 percent. Then during the last of April he modified his orders and said the number of cattle should be 80 percent for June. Then on the last day of June he ordered the quota at 90 percent for July. That is 90 percent of the number slaughtered in July 1951. All this is being done while you complain that not enough meat is going to the retailers for the family table. And, moreover, when there is no shortage of meat animals in the country. No one, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has even suggested a shortage of cattle, hogs, or sheep.

Before I proceed further I want to make it clear that this amendment deals only with quotas. This amendment has nothing to do with prices. The only way, as I see it, where it could affect prices is that it should lower them for the reason there would be a bigger supply in competition within the market limitation.

Now, I would like to say just a word or two as to how this proposal affects the farmer and feeder who produces beef for the market. Under this legislation the farmer has no assurance from month to month, or week to week, what this Bureau may do to the market on his livestock. He has no assurance whether quotas will be manipulated upward or downward. In fact, he does not even have assurance that his livestock will be sold when they go to the public market for fear the quotas are filled and there is no market for his livestock.

Somehow, you fail to realize the feeding of cattle is a long-time operation. Many farmers in my area and in other parts of the country have already marketed cattle prematurely when they should have remained in feed lots and increased their weight and quality. In other words you would have had more meat and of better quality. Farmers take a good many long risks: weather, that is rainy or dry seasons, diseases that may injure livestock, general demands for their product when ready for market. The livestock man does not ask for subsidies. He does not want a bureau limiting the number of cattle he can sell when he is told that the demand for his product is greater than is supplied in the market place. It hardly makes sense.

I have in my district a number of cattle producers and feeders, most of whom handle only livestock in small numbers. A few of them feed on a comparatively large scale. I have in mind a feeder in my community who had a continuous program of feeding and finishing 2,000 head of cattle. Early last spring he was faced with the confusion and the uncertainty, and the further risk-quota regulations, and he sold his cattle and closed his feeding operations before the cattle were finished and ready for market. Result was loss of supply of beef because cattle were underweight.

Something was said a while ago. I believe it was the gentleman from Chicago, Ill. [Mr. YATES], about holding cattle off the market. He does not realize

the farmer cannot do that very long after they are fattened even if he would choose to do so. Feeding after they are ready for market is a losing proposition. Furthermore, when the cattle are shipped to the open market there is no guaranty of price, but they must be sold unless the owner decides to ship them back home. You just do not handle livestock you would automobiles and other similar goods. Livestock are perishable goods.

You seem to set aside the idea of supply and demand. Listen to this: A week ago last Monday I talked with the head cattle buyer for one of the big four packing companies on the Kansas City market. He said he had just bought 260 steers for slaughter for that day. He said normally he would have purchased 1,200. He said the cattle were on the market, but because of quota restrictions he could buy no more. He said there was plenty of outlet for the beef. He further stated his company would be penalized by deducting from the July quota three times his overquota for the month of June. I talked to the buyer for another of the big four and he related precisely the same story. This was on Monday when the supply of cattle on the market is usually the heaviest.

Here is another thing you fail to take into account. The quota is on the basis of the number of head of livestock and not the quantity of meat. You fail to take into account that market conditions differ from year to year. This because of weather conditions, crop conditions and other things over which the farmers have no control.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I tried to get the Brooklyn cowboy to help me out, but he would not do so. Are the quotas the same over the whole United States, 90 percent of last year's?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. Under the order the quotas would apply the same in various parts of the country. If it is 90 percent in one area, it is 90 percent in other places.

Mr. VORYS. I may be ignorant, but let me ask: Do the cattle of the United States necessarily grow just exactly at the same percentage all over the United States?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. VORYS. Would it be possible for you to have a 90-percent quota in a place where cattle production was 110 percent over last year and 90 percent at another place where it is only 80 percent of last year?

Mr. REES of Kansas. There might be more cattle in an area than last year. Or there might be less cattle in a certain area than there were a year ago. Under this order the percentage quota applies the same. I was rather surprised that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] did not take cognizance of that situation when he addressed the committee earlier today.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who was kind enough to yield me his time on this amendment. The gentleman, incidentally, is quite familiar with this problem by reason of his own experience.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe it has been said that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] seriously stated in the Banking and Currency Committee that we should arrange matters so that a cow would have two calves in 1 year, without having twins. Just how that could be arranged, perhaps the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. MULTER] could say.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I read of it in a local newspaper.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman can answer the question real quickly and say "Yes" or "No," it is all right with me.

Mr. MULTER. Is that Democrat the gentleman spoke of as having 2,000 head of cattle one of the small farmers in his district?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not say he was a small operator. Neither is he crying. But he is one of the men who has produced thousands of tons of beef for the people of New York and other parts of the country. He is a successful businessman just as the gentleman from New York is a highly successful lawyer. You are not hurting him by this legislation. The fellow you are injuring is the little fellow. The strange thing about it is you are talking about protecting the little packer and the little individual, but he is the man you are killing off.

Mr. MULTER. Are we killing off Armour & Co. that made only \$3,000,000 in the first quarter of this year?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The big operator the gentleman talks about is the only one, if anybody, that gets any protection under this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, fixed slaughter quotas for livestock slaughterers are impractical and unworkable of variable and unpredictable livestock receipts on the market.

Maximum farm production requires the removal of hampering uncertainties such as the proposal under consideration. If Congress deems necessary to deal with this problem at all, it ought write a clear and definite policy that farmers can depend upon. If it is done it should not hamper the farmer in his effort to do his part in producing a sufficient supply of food in this emergency. What we need is more and more production of food in this country. The farmer will do his part if you will give him a chance. Better think of meat goals, not quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time

allotted me may be given to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that history repeats itself in 5½ years. If the gentleman from Brooklyn would look over some photostatic copies of newspaper statements I have, he might get a lesson. He would know, for instance, that cows do not have two calves in 1 year. He would know some of these things and would not have to make that statement in committee.

You know, it is very interesting, we had an OPA back in 1946. Just before the elections of that year the majority leader of this House stated, according to the newspaper:

McCORMACK urges holiday on prices.

Mr. McCORMACK also sent the following letter to the Price Administrator:

Price controls on meat and scarce food products should be suspended for 60 days. This is absolutely necessary if our hospitals and our citizens are to have sufficient meat and food supplies.

The beloved Speaker of this House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, came down into the well of the House on May 3, 1946, and made the following statement:

I may say to the gentleman from New York and to others that I have spoken to people in high places and told them I think that cattle ought to be removed from controls.

He was honest about it.

That was in 1946 after we had had 2 years of experience in trying to do something about controlling cattle.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON said on May 2, 1946:

Price controls on meat should be abandoned.

The President of the United States on October 14 found out they would not work and took controls off just ahead of the elections so he would not get this horse-meat Congress that the gentleman from Michigan was talking about.

The President of the United States said at that time:

I am convinced that the time has come when these controls can serve no useful purpose. I am more than convinced that their further continuance would do the Nation's economy more harm than good.

The then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON, now a Member of the other body said, May 2, 1946:

Price controls on meat should be abandoned, unless a 90-day test period shows packers can get livestock in something like normal volume. This is about the last chance to make it work.

These slaughter quotas bring on the black markets. The OPS states that now 15 large black markets operate in Iowa. In 1945 and 1946 we spent \$2,000,000,000 on subsidies to help you people from Brooklyn and other places to get meat. We spent \$2,000,000,000 so

that you could get cheaper meat. Well, the meat disappeared from the market.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I think the way to get more meat is not to have a 90-percent slaughter quota but to have a 110-percent or more quota. If they say, "We want more meat," well, you just let them slaughter 110 percent and you will get more meat. This way we have no place to go with the livestock, and that is what exactly is happening here in the United States today. It is the same pattern that was followed under OPA. You will be crying in 1952 for meat. The mayor of the City of New York sent a wire to the President in 1946 saying, "Please, the people of New York are starving. We must have meat." Here is a photostatic copy of the wire. He said that meat was 40 percent higher under OPA. The only place to go was the black market.

Take heed, gentlemen, history repeats itself. These meat controls, roll-backs, and price regulations are the same pattern that brought disaster under OPA. Adopt these foolish regulations and you city people will want to know your barber and butcher better than the doctor or minister.

I support this amendment to end slaughter quotas. It was adopted in the Senate by a big vote. It was even supported by the Democratic majority leader.

Mr. ABBITT. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, it is vitally necessary at times, for the welfare of our country and our way of life, that we submit to controls by those in authority; however, I do not believe in submitting to controls just for controls' sake. The Administrator has seen fit to impose slaughter quotas on various livestock, which means that no slaughter-house can operate and continue to slaughter livestock until it secures a slaughtering quota and it cannot exceed this quota regardless of the amount of livestock available in this community.

It so happens that there is more livestock in the United States this year than it was last year and ample to meet the needs and the demand of the consumer public. In view of this, slaughtering quotas have been put on beef considerably lower than the records show for last year. I cannot believe that this action will hold down inflation or help the defense effort, nor mean cheap meat to the American people. In my opinion, it will add to the inflation, create a scarcity of meat and, in general, is harmful to the welfare of our country.

It is not contended by the Office of Price Stabilization that slaughtering quotas will in any way keep down inflation nor increase the production of livestock. The only excuse they give us for putting on slaughtering quotas is so that the Office of Price Stabilization may

have an accurate record of the livestock slaughtered.

I believe that the slaughtering quotas are more harmful than they are beneficial and for that reason I intend to vote for the amendment which prohibits the Office of Price Stabilization from imposing slaughtering quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Mr. GATHINGS and Mr. ABBITT asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. POAGE.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I cannot let go unchallenged the suggestions of the opponents of this amendment that we can safely turn the administration of this control program over to any individual or agency whoever it may be, without any direct supervision on the part of Congress and expect that agency or administrator to do the kind of job that we want done. I am not here to direct any charges against Mr. DiSalle as an individual or against anyone else as an individual, but I do think that all of us have lived long enough to know that whenever we give any governmental agency or any administrator the power of economic life and death over our people that they will exercise that power, and that unless we have provided adequate safeguards, they will exercise the power in a way that will result in the destruction of many small but fine business operations. If we leave the OPS without any rules to guide its actions, it will abuse the power granted just as certainly as will any other agency when you give it unlimited and unbridled power.

Some of the proponents of the granting of unlimited power have suggested that as yet the OPS has not destroyed everyone that it could through the exercise of this power—as yet, it still allows some reasonable exemptions in the slaughtering-quota provisions. But even the proponents of this broad grant of power admit that unless this amendment is adopted the power does exist, and that it might be exercised under this bill as it now stands at any time that the administrator saw fit to exercise it.

Is the existence of such a threat calculated to encourage any business? Do you believe that we can expect to get maximum production in the United States in any line of business if we place it in a position where it can be destroyed on a moment's notice at the whim of some bureau or administrator? True, we are told by the proponents of this measure that we do not need to limit the administrator's power because he has granted reasonable exemptions. These proponents must therefore expect us to rely on the continuation of these exemptions. If the exemptions are good, if we are supposed to rely on them, why not write them into the law?

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is it not a fact that if the farmer has to keep his cattle off the market because of quota restrictions for any length of time, that the cost of the animal or the cost of the finished product goes up and must eventually be reflected in higher meat prices?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Mississippi is exactly right. Of course, that is one of the fundamental errors that so many of the proponents of the regulation have made. They assume that cowmen can keep cattle without cost. They assume cowmen can strike. Of course, cowmen have not and cannot strike. But I have even heard it down home in my district where people ought to know better. I do not find it in my heart to feel unkindly toward the gentlemen from Brooklyn or New York or Chicago who do not understand the details of cattle marketing. I do feel that my own people, all of whom have at least seen a cow, and most of whom have seen stockyards, should know that if the packers in any market can only slaughter 500 head of cattle, any day that 800 head shows up in those yards there are going to be 300 head of cattle going to irregular buyers. Most of these cattle will probably go to the black market. At least these slaughtering quotas certainly are made to order to provide the black market with a convenient supply.

Unfortunately, there are all too many people who believe that all you have to do is pass a law. That you can have all the meat you want, at 10 cents a pound if you only pass a law to that effect.

Anybody who has a fourth-grade education and will think things through, and most of us will not think things through, knows that that is not true. If it were true, all we would need to do would be to just pass laws rather than work. Nobody would work because we could just pass laws. Unfortunately, you have to work to make a living in this world. Unfortunately even this Congress cannot produce meat by just passing laws. We must still rely upon economic law rather than upon statutory law. We must rely in the final analysis upon the profit motive if we are to live under the free economic system which we believe is best.

If you are not going to rely on the profit motive, you must substitute some other motive if you are to get any production. If you take away the hope of a profit, you have to adopt the Russian system, under which the motive for production is compulsion. There just is no choice. There are only two ways to get people to produce meat or any other food. One way is by giving a man the hope he can make a profit. That is the American way. That is the way which has worked. The other way is by assuring him that he is going to be thrown into jail or the salt mines if he does not produce the meat or the other food the government orders him to produce. This is the Russian system. This is the way which has pulled everybody down to a common level of misery. I believe our

American system works the best, and I think most of us believe it. So let us stay with it.

I want to talk a moment about a fundamental principle that is involved in this matter of marketing quotas. When the gentleman insists that slaughtering quotas are necessary in the market place in order to properly distribute the meat that is coming in, he must follow that logically by an admission that quotas are going to be necessary in the butcher shop and in the grocery store, and that the housewife is inevitably going to have to carry little red meat coupons with her again. We are just as certain to have consumer rationing on meat as we are that we have quotas in the stockyards. You are not going to have the one and have it work fairly without the other. You are going to have consumer rationing just as surely as you continue the course that is now being pursued by the Office of Price Stabilization.

Do not let anybody fool you. All of this is pure eyewash when these people come along and talk to you about how they are going to lower the price of meat, reduce the amount of meat coming through the packing plants, and still let everybody buy all they want to at a low price. It cannot be done, and I do not think we are fair with the American people if we encourage them to believe it is possible. The fact that there was not enough meat to equal the demand even at high prices is the only reason that the price of meat went so high. People were willing to pay the high price in order to get it. There was not enough to supply everybody with all he wanted. None of these regulations are going to produce an extra pound of beef. How, then, can we honestly hold onto the hope that we can supply everyone who wants beef with all he would like to buy? If the price does go down it will surely increase, not decrease, the demand for beef. It will make less, not more, beef to be divided. If we slaughter only 80 percent or 90 percent as much beef as we did last year, who is going to get that beef? Will the first housewife to the butcher shop get all she wants and the latecomers get none? My colleagues, you know that there is but one answer. If you reduce the number of cattle slaughtered in the legitimate market, you inevitably force rationing in the butcher shop—and you drive the cattle that the legitimate packer could not buy into the black-market channels.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the idea of establishing slaughtering quotas is far removed from the American idea of justice. It gives to those who may have a quota now a vested right to continue in business, and it shuts the door to everyone else. It will result in higher prices of meat. If you reduce the amount of meat that is to be distributed by lowering the slaughtering quotas, that meat is going to be

higher. It will send more meat into the black market.

What does this country lose when we follow a course that builds up the black market? In the first place, this clandestine slaughtering means that the Nation loses the important medicines that are byproducts of the packing industry. We strike fear into the hearts of thousands of people in the country because of the shortage of vital medicines. When we restrict the amount of meat that can be slaughtered in ordinary channels, we send it to the slaughtering sources where the Federal Government loses the taxes involved.

(By unanimous consent the time allotted to Mr. CLEMENTE was granted to Mr. SPENCE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. DOLLINGER, Mr. CHUDOFF, Mrs. BOSONE, and Mr. BARRETT was given to Mr. MCCARTHY.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I assume the House really wants to know how a quota is determined and why it is determined. Some Members who have spoken before me know very well what the purpose of the quota is and how it is determined. I do not think there is much excuse for their having left the House in confusion on that point. They have stated that the quota has the effect of preventing the farmers from marketing their livestock when it is ready to go to market. Let me explain to you just how a quota is determined.

The United States Department of Agriculture gives the Office of Price Stabilization an estimate of the number of cattle, calves, hogs, sheep, and lambs that may come to market in the next month. In other words, the Department estimates how much livestock would come into the market even if we had a free market operating. Then, this estimate is expressed in terms of a percentage of the amount of the same kind of livestock marketed in the same month of the preceding year.

So, if they estimate for a free market—that is, if the Department of Agriculture estimates that in a free market 110 percent, in terms of the number of cattle, would be marketed in the month of July, over what was marketed in that month a year ago, the Department sets the quota at 110 percent. If they estimate that in the operation of a free market with no controls and no restraints, only 90 percent as many cattle are going to be marketed, then they set the quota at 90 percent for the month of July. Then the OPS sets its quotas roughly in line with the United States Department of Agriculture estimate. That is the first step. That is how it is set up.

Now the next question is why is it set up? It is set up chiefly to protect all packers and slaughterers who are licensed. The quota simply means that if you are a licensed packer you have the right to buy 90 percent of what you

slaughtered in the same month of the previous year. If you are a licensed big packer you can buy 90 percent, and if you are a small packer who is licensed you get 90 percent.

A previous speaker asked the question, Why do they not set the quota at 110 percent? To set the quota at 110 would have no effect unless the Government were to go out and force the farmers to market their livestock to meet the quota. Understand, this quota is simply an estimate of the number of cattle that would come into the market if we had a free market operating. It is set up in order to insure each packer's getting his fair share of the livestock marketed.

There is one more point I would like to make. There is no official intent to reduce the marketings by the use of quotas. I will quote now from a farm letter of Mr. Wayne Darrow of June 2, 1951, and his is the proper interpretation:

There is no official intent to reduce marketings by the use of quotas.

The only intention is to get a fair distribution of livestock that comes into the market.

Now, just to show you how this quota system has been misunderstood and misrepresented, let me quote from another farm letter which goes out of Washington, the Washington Farm Reporter, May 26, edited by Fred Bailey. He says:

The June slaughter quotas are due out soon and will call for another reduction in the slaughter of beef cattle.

Now, the quota has nothing to do with reduction of slaughtering. It is simply an estimate of the number of cattle that will come into the market, into a free market. Mr. Bailey and a number of Members who have spoken say it calls for reduction. It does not call for a reduction. It simply is an estimate of the percent of livestock which will come into the market this month and a determination that each packer shall get his fair share.

The quota is not something that is fixed. I would like to point out to you that if it is found that the estimated quota is wrong, it can be changed and Mr. DiSalle said this before the Committee on Agriculture, as I recall, "we can change the quota in 24 hours."

Now, to make the point clearer, the OPS made two upward quota adjustments in the month of May, one in Minnesota and in Wisconsin when calf marketings exceeded the 80 percent quota, and one in the Missouri River marketings when hog marketings ran 120 to 123 percent of May 1950. They adjusted it upward to meet the actual marketing supply.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Suppose there are some individuals who would like to start a new slaughtering plant; how are they going to get a quota?

Mr. MCCARTHY. They are not going to get a quota, because they are not licensed.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Why should they not get a license?

Mr. McCARTHY. Because we are trying to establish some kind of order. Does the cotton farmer under the allotment program get a permit to grow cotton when he has not done it before? No. We say that we have to establish some kind of order. What about the tobacco grower under the allotment program? If he has a history of growing cotton or a history of growing tobacco or a history of growing peanuts, he will get his quota. If not, he gets nothing.

I do not yield further now.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman says the quota does not limit the production.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said it is not set up as a limitation. It might have that effect late in the month, but OPS can make adjustments.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman says they can change it in 24 hours, but I call attention to the fact that one day last week they had a run of hogs in Kansas City. The receipt of hogs was 5,400, which has been exceeded only once this year. The news account of that situation says:

A liberal number of hogs was shipped elsewhere for slaughter. A restricted slaughter quota announced for this month was a factor in the lower prices and the shipper movement. The OPS cut the hog quota from 115 percent to 105 percent of a year ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I have the gentleman's point. I know that there have been temporary dislocations. However, the information has been left here today that under the quota system there is a possibility that there will be livestock left over. It has even been suggested that we will have to burn the surplus pigs. This is ridiculous. There will be 100 percent sale and slaughter of all the livestock that the farmers wish to sell. The quota as I have said before is simply an estimate of the percent of last year's monthly supply that is expected to be put on the market during the same month of this year. In 1 month it may be 80 percent, in another month it may be 120 percent or 130 percent, or even 150 percent. In any case, I repeat, in the course of the year, 100 percent of all livestock which farmers wish to sell, can be sold. There has been much concern expressed here today that beef cattle have not been coming into the market. The fixing of quota has had no bearing on this fact. Anyone who is considering this livestock question today should know that it takes approximately 3 years to produce a first-grade steer from breeding to slaughter. The decision to increase the supply of beef must be made several years in advance of the actual increase in the supply on the market. During 1949, when the farm price of cattle averaged \$19.90 per hundredweight, cattlemen added 1,800,000 head to their herds. During

1950 when they were getting approximately \$23.10 per hundredweight producers increased their herds by 4,100,000 head. If beef is not coming to the market today, it is not because of the quota system. It is due to any one or a combination of these factors. Either the cattlemen are holding them off the market in the hope that the roll-back may be repealed or prices increased. They are holding them off because the cattle are not ready for the market or they may be withholding breeding stock in order to increase the size of the marketable beef a year from now or 2 years from now. Some of the members who have spoken advocating quotas of 110 or 120 seem to think that by fixing such a quota it will follow in some miraculous manner that more beef will be put on the market. I do hope that they are not advocating that the cattle growers be forced to market their cattle in order to bring the price of beef down. I am sure that no one here wants to force the farmers of this country to market their cattle contrary to their own wishes. On the other hand, it is not the purpose of the quota to keep them from marketing the cattle before they wish to.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that the setting of quotas for people on historical records is what is being done right now throughout industry. All of the short metals are allocated on the basis of percentage to historical use. If a new user wants to come in and use steel or aluminum, he cannot get an allocation. He just does not go into the business. It is a recognition of the fact that we are in an emergency and such materials as we have must be allocated fairly. They allocate them to the people who have a record of prior use, and that is the only fair way to work it out.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman is absolutely right. We have been using it in the farm program.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Absolutely. It is nothing new.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, and certainly my question is directed in that way, but the comparison you draw between cotton controls and tobacco controls, while I think they are proper, giving the permission to stay in business to the packer, is similar, I do think you have pointed your finger at the chief weakness of this approach of having controls on slaughtering, because in that case it is a question of having too large a supply and your purpose is to hold down production. I think in this instance, where the supply is short, you are falling into the same mistake.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not yield further. The gentleman is confusing the picture again, because the quota does not

have as its purpose any reduction. The over-all purpose is simply to provide an orderly workable procedure so that every packer who has a license can get his fair share of the available supply.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not an economist, but when Mr. DiSalle tells us that the quota system on slaughtering is just an administrative device to control the black market, it is difficult for me to go along with him. To me it seems when you have a limitation on what a packer can slaughter it limits the supply that he can buy; and when he is limited to 90 percent in his purchases as against the supply of last year, that limits the supply of meat that he can sell through legitimate channels of trade.

Mr. JENSEN. And they adhere to it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And there is a strict penalty enforced against the packer when he is out of compliance. So rather than go into the market and buy the supply that is on the market he limits his purchasing in order to keep away from penalties.

When the packer goes into the registered market to buy livestock, he faces stiff competition for the cattle from numerous order-buyers. These order-buyers have received orders from all parts of the country for cattle and other livestock. Some of the livestock purchased by order-buyers may go into the black market. The packer is forced to stay in compliance for his quota and price paid for livestock established by the OPS. He dare not bid up the price because of the penalties involved. In view of this situation some of the livestock purchased by order-buyers will pass into black-market channels, and the supply of meat through legitimate channels will be reduced for the consumers, and result in higher consumer prices.

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

(Mr. GAMBLE and Mr. WOLCOTT asked and were given permission to yield their time to Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes additional.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Now we have 5,000,000 more people in the United States than we had last year—155,000,000 people at the present time, according to the Census Bureau, so we need more meat rather than less. The livestock population of the United States has increased around 3,000,000, I am told by the Department of Agriculture, in the last year.

Now if you want to provide more meat to the people through legitimate channels you should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas so that slaughtering may be increased over and above the quota.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. JENKINS. I have one packing house in my district; it is quite a considerable operation. What the gentle-

man mentioned a few minutes ago is exactly their experience.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And unless we take this action we are going to find the same situation we found in the last part of 1946 and early 1947 where 80 percent of the beef which was sold in this country went through black-market channels and at black-market prices.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be given to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I must yield to the gentleman who so kindly yielded me his time.

Mr. TALLE. I cannot resist recalling the testimony that was given before the Committee on Banking and Currency in the closing days of World War II. We were talking about black-market operations, so much of the meat then was going into the black market. I remember one witness, a gentleman from Texas, said we could not control slaughtering because people could slaughter wherever there was a tree and a brook. He added: "In the United States there are a lot of trees and a lot of brooks." The Congress should not encourage black-market operations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was a member of the so-called Anderson committee in 1946 that was headed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who later became Secretary of Agriculture. We had hearings in the great city of New York about the meat situation. You should have been with us at that time, because 80 to 90 percent of the meat sold in New York City was sold at black-market prices.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] admitted that there would be dislocations in this quota deal. Who is going to compensate the farmers and raisers of livestock such as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] cited where they have 5,000 head that they cannot absorb in the Kansas City market and had to be shipped somewhere else? Who is going to compensate the farmer for the loss in shipping?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There will be nobody to compensate the farmer for that loss; he must take that loss himself; and the consumers of the country will pay higher prices because the meat will not flow into normal channels of trade.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman recall any black-market operations in a free market?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, of course not. There is no incentive for the

black-market operator to operate on a free market.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed earlier by the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I have a letter here from a concern that is not in the gentleman's district which came to my office today. It is awfully close to the district represented by the gentleman from Illinois. This is from a small packer who says:

We own and operate a small pork-processing plant in Chicago under BAI inspection. Due to the irregularities created by a low base period, we were frozen in a loss position.

So far this year our operation shows a loss of \$16,386.25 as of June 16, 1951, compared to a profit of \$54,724.41 as of June 17, 1950.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] probably received the same letter in this morning's mail.

May I say that it does not make much difference whether you proceed under this plan or this plan over there, you will have a black market. There will be a certain number of people go into the black-market business. But I believe this one over here will work a little bit better for one or two reasons.

The people, as was demonstrated here by the gentleman from Nebraska, take their livestock down to the processing yard and there is no legal sale to be made because the quota has been filled for that day. That man is going to sell his on the black market, although ordinarily he is not that kind of a fellow.

A lot of the gentlemen over on the opposition side, have been for small business. It seems to me you are going to drive the small packer and the small processor out of business if you adopt this procedure, because the small fellows have a margin of only 10 to 20 percent with which to operate on and when we have this kind of 80-percent business it will make it impossible for them to operate at a profit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me may be given to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, there are a certain number of Members of this House who are against direct controls and whether we adopt this amendment or not they are going to vote against the bill. A great many of those have been speaking.

This particular amendment affects the rest of us, who I hope are in a majority in the House, who are going to support the controls bill and want it to be fair.

Nothing has been said about the fact that there is no other practical way of controlling the slaughterer than by the quota system. There is no licensing provision in the Defense Production Act or under this bill except under this quota system. That is the only way to keep our hands on the slaughterer; therefore, it seems to me strange that the argument is made that if we do not keep our hands on him by defeating this amendment we are going to have less rather than more black-marketing operations. It seems to me that if we deprive ourselves of the ability to keep our hands on him that is the very way to get more rather than less of black-market meat—the very thing we want to avoid.

The only real control over meat that is linked to price control is the control of the slaughterer. There is no rationing of meat and it seems to me if we want to avoid rationing—and I think many of us certainly want to—we need to have this kind of control at the source rather than to take it off. To defeat this amendment is the way to get less control rather than more control.

I think all of the arguments in support of this amendment, other than from those who are just against direct controls, head up to the fear that some unreasonable regulation will be made by the Price Administrator. I think it would be perfectly fair to insert an amendment to the bill writing into the last section of the act, section 716, a provision that the Congress shall have residual control, to be exercised by concurrent resolution, not only over the act and the sections of the act but also over the regulations, rules, and orders and amendments to them issued under the act's authority.

So, if we feel that regulations may become arbitrary or discriminatory or block out new producers—and I am against that, too; I think there must be quotas available for new producers and small producers—then we always have the residual power in the Congress to correct that situation. If we are in favor of the fundamental principle of direct controls, we have a right to the protection that regulations shall not be arbitrary or capricious.

Otherwise, I can see this amendment to bar slaughterer's quotas as nothing else but a further effort to dilute the opportunity to really make price controls stick and make them strong. I think if we have this protection against arbitrary and unreasonable regulations, we protect ourselves fully against anything the Administrator may do which would be unfair.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that the Department of Agriculture at the present time licenses all packers of this country and that all of the States have sanitary regulations which require conformance by the packers?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, but this right to establish slaughterer's quotas, barred by this amendment, ties what is in effect licensing to this price stabilization law, to compliance with this law and to operation under this law, and that is exactly why I say that we would have less regulation of black markets in meat rather than more unless we defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, first let me say to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that I, too, received this morning the letter he quoted, and that I am as interested as he is in protecting the small packer. I believe, however, that the way to protect the small packer under a system of price controls is through the quota system established by the Office of Price Stabilization. Of course, if we are to have no price controls, there is no need for such a quota system, but inasmuch as I believe such controls on food prices are essential at this time, I shall oppose this amendment.

There has been much talk during these debates of packers, of farmers, and of slaughterers. Nobody has mentioned the consumer. Apparently, the great American consumer is the forgotten man, and little attention is being given to his needs, his interests, and his rights. As I listen to this debate, I cannot avoid the feeling that the raid is on—that this debate should be called the great gold rush of 1951, and just as prospectors raced to file their claims in the gold fields of California in 1849, so today and during the days to come claims are being staked right now in the pockets of the American consumers. Earlier today the oil and fat interests staked out their claims. This amendment is the claim being staked out by the beef and livestock interests, and I am sure that later on the cotton people and the other agricultural interests will drive through amendments to assure their participation in the apparently rich lode in the pockets of the consumers. And this, Mr. Chairman, is without benefit of any kind of depletion allowance for the consumer, which most of the same gentlemen insist is necessary for those engaged in the mining and oil industries in our Nation. On the contrary, they would fix the wages and earnings of the consumers at present levels, unrealistic levels in the face of the increases in food costs which are inevitable with the elimination of price controls on food products.

This is a game of "heads I win; tails you lose," and the American consumer is always the loser. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] a few moments ago stated that increased production will compel a reduction in prices and that we cannot get it under a controls system. This attitude truly fails to take into account the realities of our farm program, of which he is such a champion, because no matter how much production is achieved there will never be a substan-

tial reduction in farm prices because of price supports. Two years ago we had a surplus in almost all agricultural commodities, but the prices could not go down because of price supports. Then we had the case of "heads I win," because the consumer-taxpayers had to pay the costs of sustaining support prices. Now we are faced with shortages in such commodities, and we have the case of "tails you lose," because when the gentlemen insist that farm prices should have no ceilings in an economy which controls other prices and earnings, again the consumers must pay.

Mr. Chairman, this insistence upon special privilege for one segment of our economy is not only unfair; it is positively immoral. This is a time which demands equal sacrifice from all of our people, from the farmers as well as the city dwellers, from the producers as well as the consumers. You cannot in good conscience compel the consumers to shoulder a discriminatory and disproportionate share of the burden.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

AGAINST SLAUGHTERING RESTRICTIONS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, when a farmer takes his produce to the market and sells it, he at that moment collects his wage; he does not collect it at any other time. The debate this afternoon has indicated that a farmer should not collect the highest wage he can. That amazes me coming from Members of a body like this. On what grounds can you ask a farmer to cut the income of his family on which his wife and children depend, simply to sell meat below a price which he can get? Unless this amendment is adopted, this program will drive the farmer into the black market in order to maintain his wage, and he is entitled, to maintain that wage just the same as any union member in industry is entitled to maintain his wage under a collective-bargaining agreement. By what line of reasoning would you have the farmer cut his wage and at the same time allow advances in wages of union workers? Over 800 farmers in my district and a lot of city people have written me to oppose the controls which have been pushed against them, and less than 40 have asked me to support the control program. Naturally, on the basis of my common sense and ordinary judgment, plus the support of my people, I will oppose the controls as called for by this bill and support the Hope amendment to remove slaughtering restrictions.

(Mr. HAYS of Ohio and Mr. GREEN asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. SPENCE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, and to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESS IN CRISIS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we celebrated July Fourth, Independence Day. Many of us were back home making patriotic speeches to the folks in our districts, discussing the needs of the day in terms of the historical traditions of our great Nation. It is very likely that in discussing the concept of a free America which reached its fateful achievement for the first time 175 years ago, we in the Congress developed somewhere in our themes the place of the Congress in protecting the rights of the American people, in safeguarding their liberties, in legislating in the interests of the whole people.

Mr. Chairman, we have every right to stress the fundamental role of Congress in safeguarding the public interest. That role is basic. But how a particular Congress might stand up to its responsibilities is sometimes something altogether different from the basic role, the basic concept.

Congresses are judged, Mr. Chairman, by the manner in which they react in time of stress, in time of crisis. This Congress is a Congress in crisis. This bill now before us, the Defense Production Act, is a measure which is a test of our resolve to stand up to our responsibilities.

Will we examine this bill objectively, Mr. Chairman, and study its provisions carefully, and, in view of world conditions we recognize as difficult and dangerous, lend our support unstintingly to the crusade launched by this great Nation in defense throughout the world of the freedom we ourselves inherited from the bravery and resolution of Americans 175 years ago? Or will we turn and run? Will we find good reasons to overcome our collective conscience and, instead of what is right and necessary, vote for those things politically most palatable?

Actually, there is no real dilemma for us on that question. The best politics, as I think we have all learned, is government in the public interest—in the interest of all of the people. Special interests and special pleaders may rend the air with threats of the reprisals they can command at election day, but the fact remains that when the people have the facts, the special pleaders fight a losing vendetta at the polls.

Mr. Chairman, in this fight over decent price control and anti-inflation legislation, the facts will not be suppressed; the people will know the facts. This legislation cannot help but become increasingly important as a public issue as time goes by and as the inflationary pressures we know are ahead in the next few years begin to bear down hard on the purchasing power and the standard of living of my constituents and those of every other Member of Congress.

This bill is not the perfect anti-inflation bill. In my opinion, it has some

serious faults. As it has come from the Committee on Banking and Currency after exhaustive hearings and, I am sure, sympathetic consideration, it leaves big gaps in the line against inflation. I shall vote to strengthen it in every possible respect. I shall vote to insure against inflation wrecking our economy. But whether or not my views prevail on every clause or section or amendment, I want to be able to tell my constituents, Mr. Chairman, that 175 years after the freedom of America was proclaimed, the Congress of the United States was not unmindful of its duties and its obligations to the people of this democracy in time of crisis.

The people of my district are not apathetic about this legislation, Mr. Chairman, and, frankly, I do not think the people anywhere else in the United States are apathetic either. Some Members of Congress may not have received any floods of mail about price control—except from those special-interest groups trying to destroy it—but the people in my district have made clear in no uncertain terms how they feel about the need for protection against inflation in this emergency.

They know what has happened to the price of milk in the Newark area in the year since the start of the Korean war—up more than 16 percent. More than 16 percent—think of it. A loaf of bread in the vicinity of Newark today costs nearly 12 percent more than it did a year ago. Who gets that extra money—the farmer? Not at all. We have learned to our chagrin in the Congress that when the price of grain goes up 50 cents or a dollar a bushel, the price of bread inevitably has to go up, too, because we are told, of increased grain costs. And then, when the price of grain goes down a dollar or so a bushel, does the price of bread go down, too? Not at all. We are then told that the cost of the grain is such a small proportion of the cost of making a loaf of bread that a decrease of even 33 percent or more in the price of grain is not enough to be reflected by a decrease in the cost of a loaf of bread.

It is only when the price of grain goes up, it appears, that grain suddenly becomes an important cost item in bread-making.

That is the kind of economic double-talk my constituents are getting fed up with. And getting fed up on economic nonsense is no substitute for getting the foods they need at prices they can afford.

Mr. Chairman, when the National Association of Manufacturers comes in here and turns its multi-million-dollar lobby loose to kill price controls, we need only remember the promises of that organization in 1946—kill price control, it said, and there will be plenty of roast beef, plenty of butter, plenty of everything for everybody at prices the people can afford to pay.

And the Congress did, in fact, kill price control. Not with a straight clean blow, but by slow torture until of necessity it collapsed and died. And what happened? The black markets in meat

which the NAM had talked so glibly about ending merely by ending price control suddenly turned into legalized robbery instead of the criminal kind. Before a year had passed, black-market prices for meat were put to shame by the exorbitant legal prices shamelessly charged by the meat trust in the great era of an unbridled economic free-for-all let loose by the death of price control.

Round steak by 1947 had shot up to 84 cents a pound, which was 18 cents a pound higher than the black-market price in OPA days—and most Americans did not patronize black markets during OPA no matter what the pressure groups say.

And where is round steak today? It went up to \$1.02 in Newark on the average a year ago—right before Korea. The last official figure from the Bureau of Labor Statistics on meat prices in Newark is for April, when the price was 11 percent higher than pre-Korea—\$1.14 a pound. And as everyone knows, it went even higher than that and it is still higher.

In this anti-roll-back amendment voted by the House Banking and Currency Committee, the price of beef in Newark cannot go any lower and will probably have to go even higher.

Where is the justice, Mr. Chairman, the fairness, the decency in that? What are my people to do? There is one thing they can do if the Congress refuses to cut out this profiteering with an effective price-control statute, and that is demand higher and higher pay to keep up with the spiraling cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware that there are a great many fair-minded and considerate people in the district which I represent. They realize the need for effective controls, too. These people are patriotic, unselfish, and willing to make their contribution to the defense effort. However, as they have expressed it to me, they seek fair and equitable treatment. They believe that if we are to continue controls, we should hold the line all over and not give way to certain preferred groups. And they are right. For, unless these controls are effective and across the board, the result would be penalizing those who voluntarily refrained from raising prices and rewarding those who jacked up prices unreasonably prior to the general price freeze.

This inequality of treatment might wreck the whole price-control program by making it impossible for the control agencies to lower the ceiling prices of beef, clothing, shoes, and other essential living-cost items. This would further destroy belief in the efficacy of price controls.

Therefore, once again we must decide which is to be put first, the national interest or the special interest.

And, in this defense emergency, if they put selfishness first the way a lot of special interests are doing, they will get higher and higher pay rates and the whole stabilization program will go out the window.

With higher rents recommended in this bill, with the proposal that beef prices be regarded as sacred and secure against any roll-backs, with butter up somewhere between 80 and 90 cents a pound and coffee selling at nearly \$1, with a shortage of decent accommodations that people can afford to buy or rent, and with profits at shamefully high levels—while wage rates remain virtually frozen—there is bound to be an explosion in this economy that will rock the whole country at a time of crisis.

The press will scream about labor imperiling the defense effort. But the people will not be fooled by the sound and fury—if this Congress today, this week, on this bill, caves in and gives in to the profiteers wanting their pound of the people's flesh.

The time to prevent unrest and resentment and a lowering of morale that would weaken our defense effort is right now. It must be the best price-control bill we can devise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. BOLLING.)

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I think I have heard more piety here this afternoon than in some time. It is very clear that everybody is for everybody else. We are anxious to do the best thing we can for our country but we are going to be sure to take care of our own constituents regardless of what happens to the rest of the country.

Let us take off our false whiskers. It is quite clear what we are doing if we vote for elimination of this slaughter quota provision. If we do that, we will knock out any effective control over black markets. If we do that we will in effect knock out any chance of effective price control on meat. We are, by voting to knock out slaughter quotas, which is a technique to insure equitable distribution and nothing else, in effect making it entirely clear that we do not want to serve the country as a whole and have fair and equitable prices on meat.

It seems to me a little ridiculous for those who would defend their own to come in here with piety defending 152 percent of parity. It seems to me wise for the gentlemen to take thought. It may well be that the other farmers in the country will resent the fact that the beef producers have said over and over again that parity means nothing. I think we might pause briefly if we are interested in the long-run welfare of our constituents as well as of the country as a whole to see what we are doing.

The exact reverse of the process undertaken by the Office of Price Stabilization took place under the Office of Price Administration during the last war. OPA failed to establish slaughter quotas until quite late in the game. As a result, when they did, they legalized a number of black marketers who had come in before slaughter quotas were

established. If we eliminate the slaughter quota provision, we are sure to have an indefinite number of those black-market trees and those black-market barns and those black-market streams used to the detriment of the American people, detrimental from the point of view of sanitation and detrimental from the point of view of all the very important byproducts.

Let us quit kidding ourselves, if we are, and certainly let us quit trying to kid the public.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, the Hope amendment seeks to prevent the OPS from the further use of the quota system. It is as simple as that. It has nothing whatever to do with price controls, and I feel very strongly that the amendment should be adopted.

No doubt the OPS, in establishing quotas, are seeking to regulate the orderly production and distribution of meat. The difficulty is, as in so many cases where we tamper with the national economy, it is impossible to work justice. A notable example has recently arisen in my own district. A packing plant quite recently established, or perhaps I should say, revived, was assigned a quota of 2,754,000 pounds of swine annually. This plant has modern facilities for production and employs 22 persons. The quota allowed is not sufficient to keep them operating even at half time. The union labor in the plant quite properly insists upon full-time employment. Under the quota allowed the plant cannot operate. While waiting for an adjustment from OPS, the management is literally paying men for doing nothing.

What will be the net result?

First. The capital invested in the plant will be lost.

Second. The employees of the plant will lose profitable employment.

Third. A substantial quantity of meat will be lost to production and to normal and lawful markets.

Fourth. A significant percentage of that meat will eventually go into the black market.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of a system just will not work.

I am just hopeful enough to believe that Mr. Gregg of OPS intends to try at least to make an equitable adjustment of this situation. His office has dealt with me courteously. The fact remains that the quota system is a bad one, will indirectly lead to inflated prices by restricting production and by diverting meat into the black market under unsanitary and expensive conditions.

The farmers of my area have no other convenient market place to deliver their stock. I am no expert, but I know you cannot continue feeding a hog after it is ready for the market without inviting bankruptcy. The authority to establish quotas is one which cannot be worked out with equity and justice, and defeats the very purpose of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. Chairman, I am including herewith a few of the communications I have from my district on this problem as follows:

JULY 3, 1951.

Congressman HAND,
Second District, New Jersey,
House of Congress Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wildwood Packing Co., Rio Grande. Important market, our swine. We do not want to lose it. We find Manager Dresnin honest and square. This custom slaughterer Cape May asset. Employees trained since last July not willing, remain half-time jobs because full work at beach. OPS has refused appeal thinking Dresnin greedy, selfish motives. Quota 200,000 pounds swine weekly and no cattle. Could continue operate.

CAPE MAY COUNTY BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
RUSSELL TAYLOR, President.
Rural Delivery, Cape May.

CAPE MAY COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wildwood, N. J., July 7, 1951.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress, Second District,
New Jersey, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAND: It has been called to our attention that the quota given by OPS to the Wildwood Packing Co., at Rio Grande, is not of sufficient size to permit continued operation.

The plant is still open, running at a loss in hope of securing adjustment upward. Without going into long detail it is easy to see that a force of men cannot be held together with work occupying 2 or 3 days per week.

This custom slaughterhouse is presently well run and is a real asset to Cape May County. Any aid which you can give Harry Dresnin, manager, in securing favorable answer to his hardship appeal will be greatly appreciated.

T. B. HAMM, President
(For the County Chamber of Commerce).

Finally I want to include a very illuminating letter from the official government of the County of Cape May written by the Honorable Walter H. Treen, a director of the board of chosen freeholders. This explains the situation concisely.

BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS,
COUNTY OF CAPE MAY, N. J.,
July 6, 1951.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress, Second District,
New Jersey, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MILLET: Upon a request of a farmer, Allan McClain, of Green Creek, I called at the Wildwood Packing Co., Rio Grande, N. J., July 3. I also consulted with Henry White, the agricultural agent of Cape May County, who has had many talks with Harry Dresnin.

The Wildwood Packing Co. was purchased by the present owners in December 1949, being acquired for the slaughter of swine. During the first 9 months or so, cattle were slaughtered to keep the plant operating, and plant changes were being made so hogs could be handled efficiently. Cattle were slaughtered during the period of January 7, 1950, to September 23, 1950, and none since. Slaughter of swine began in a small way July 15, 1950, when 255 head per week were killed. Mr. Harry Dresnin became manager in September 1950, at which time the output increased.

Very soon thereafter, the plant became unionized, and the union requiring full-time

work for the men. Working 40 hours per week the union output was up to 950 head per week (188,100 pounds) before the end of 1950 and has been above 200,000 pounds weekly many times since. With the union demanding full-time work and with plenty of employment available at the beaches, the OPS, which is too small for even half-time work in July, will apparently force this plant to close. Mr. Dresnin has been paying help for not working while trying to hold the men until the quota matter is settled.

Dresnin reported to Mr. White that he is not interested in any quota of cattle. He is set up for hog slaughter and he would not consider a cattle slaughter at all, except as a last resort to keep the plant open if the OPS refuses to adjust the swine quota upward.

The OPS, seeking orderly marketing of meat products, uses formulae much to the disadvantage of the Wildwood Packing Co. Quotas given are based on past history. Here is a custom slaughterhouse, specializing in swine, with quota based on a period when a start was being made, assembly-line methods being installed, and local men being trained.

The OPS calls the plant's capacity 168,000 pounds per week (8,777,600 per year) and grants 75-percent quota (6,583,000 pounds per year) with only 85,000 for July and 115,000 for August. The plant operates on a charge of 1 percent per pound. When 200,000 pounds are killed weekly the income is \$2,000. I understand the weekly costs of labor and operating overhead amount to \$1,800 per week. It is very apparent then that operating with the July quota of 85,000 pounds with the income of \$850 would leave considerable deficit in operation.

Farmers of our county have been working to adjust their farms to crops which meet modern requirements. Beans, a good crop, occupy too many acres. One solution has been to shift to more swine. Among the larger growers in this area are McClain, Walter Barber & Son, John Hall, and the Germanio's. The Wildwood Packing Co. has purchased these locally produced hogs on the basis of the day's market price. Farmers in this area have found this outlet superior to the Woodstown and more-distant markets. They feel that it will hurt this enlarging animal industry to lose this company.

I understand that you have kindly sought to aid the Wildwood Packing Co. in this situation. If you can do anything further, I would appreciate it. I have been interested in the industries for Cape May County and here is one that the farmers say is well run and is important to them. I sincerely hope that OPS can be convinced that Dresnin's requests are sincere and honest, and not an attempt to override an agency which is seeking orderly marketing of swine during a national emergency.

Kind personal regards.

Yours truly,

WATER H. TREEN.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate some Members have qualified as experts on this subject and others have pretended to be. I make no such pretense, but I think that the facts in this case are very clear, and that this recitation makes some contribution to the discussion of the question.

I trust that the Hope amendment will be adopted in the interest of equity and justice, and indeed in the interest of fair emergency legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the perpetuation of monopoly should never be tolerated. It seems to me that the existing licensing and quota system perpetuates a monopoly for the big beef packers in the country and eliminates the possibility for a small packer or packers to enter the field. Completion is thus stifled, and a black market in meat will inevitably develop under such a system. In addition, by a scarcity of beef held off the market, the price to the consumer will thus go up. Let us have free competition, not a black market, and cheaper food prices for the consumers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the debate thus far on this most important legislation has been too partisan. Too much interest shown for special groups. The combating of the evil of inflation should not be a partisan matter. It is a job for all of us to accomplish.

Frankly, the people of the great district which I have the honor to represent, being good Americans, do not like and do not want controls, but, being highly patriotic Americans, they recognize the need and necessity for some type of protection and some action in this regard during the continuance of this emergency to protect all Americans—protect our economy from the virus of inflation.

The people of my district feel that if controls are necessary and required—and such seems to be the case at this particular time—that they should be across the board, so to speak, and all along the line, fairly affecting all our people, all segments of the economy—industry, labor and commerce—alike and fairly.

No one wants controls—except on the other fellow. Manufacturers do not want controls to limit their profits. Labor does not want ceilings put on their wages and earning capacity. Our farmers and producers do not want a freeze on their efforts and productive capacity. No one segment of our economy and our people like controls for themselves or their group, yet each recognizes that some type of stabilization is necessary for the well-being of our country at this time.

I want to make my position clear—and that is that if we are to have controls they should be across the board—over-all and all along the line—fair to all and fairly administered. Otherwise, there should be none.

Our farmers do not like the freeze on raw cotton and our cattlemen do not like the roll-back on beef prices. They properly insist that it is unfair to permit prices of other products to go up while the products of the farm are held down and, in some instances, reduced.

There are no more patriotic citizens than our American farmers, and they are willing to make their share of the sacrifices so long as they are treated fairly and equally with the others and not discriminated against.

If the prices of farm products are to be held down the manufactured prod-

ucts which the farmers have to buy—farm machinery and such—should likewise be held down. If the prices of farm products are rolled back, then the prices of products produced by the manufacturers should be rolled back. Fairness and equity of sacrifice all along the line should be the order of this legislation.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the Committee, I should like to read a few brief statements taken from the extensive record of the testimony taken before the committee. These excerpts are from the testimony of men who have no special axes to grind, who represent no special interest groups, but men whose qualifications to speak on the subject are well known and whose testimony on this vital question should be listened to and heard with respect.

Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, whose qualification to speak on this matter is certainly recognized and whose views are sought, had this to say:

The existing law should be extended for at least a year. Our last, our best hope for averting another world war lies in getting stronger militarily without delay. We have hardly begun to rearm. We cannot strengthen our defenses as quickly as we must without effective control over the entire economy, so that our resources make the maximum contribution to the defense. The law should be strengthened by eliminating all favoritism and exemptions to any and all individuals and groups. * * * To stop inflation, action must be taken across the whole economy, over all prices, all wages, all rents, all costs.

Now, let me quote briefly from the testimony of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, and former president of General Electric—a businessman who is charged with the responsibility of administering this program.

The defense program has not yet had anywhere near the maximum impact on the economy. The greatest scarcities * * * are yet to come. Similarly, the greatest pressures on prices and wages—the most serious threat of inflation—will be felt some months from now. We have obligated for military procurement more than \$27,000,000,000 and by July 1, 1952, we shall have obligated an additional \$57,000,000,000. The inflationary pressures coming up are not psychological—they are very real—arising from the full impact of the production program. * * * Until our security has been assured, we cannot relax, we cannot slacken our efforts.

I also feel in this connection, Mr. Chairman that we would be advised to listen to what Mr. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has told the committee—Mr. Martin, as we all know, being also qualified to speak on the subject of finances and national economy:

The full effects of expansion for defense purposes are still to be felt. * * * Federal expenditures for defense and related activities are scheduled to rise sharply and may account for as much as 20 percent of total output within a year. It would be extremely unfortunate if any of the means we have been using to stem the inflationary

tide should be allowed to lapse at this critical moment when they are achieving a considerable measure of success.

Further, Mr. Martin testified—and this seems to me important in view of statements made here yesterday that credit restriction and credit controls alone should be employed:

I think that we would still need to use all of the weapons in our arsenal to halt this inflationary tide. I think that the conventional, orthodox methods of credit control must be exercised, but they alone will not do the job in a quasi-war situation and a situation which changes from week to week and month to month and is, therefore, not predictable in any precise sense. * * * We have to use a variety of weapons across the board and no one of them alone will do the whole job.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that Russia has not altered her long-term plans, despite the cease-fire negotiations under way. We must continue to prepare our military arm and strengthen our economy. It is the consensus of many in a position to know that the greatest pressures on our economy from our present defense program are yet to come.

We should, therefore, not relax our effort following a truce in Korea, which we hope and pray may properly materialize.

Let me urge that we strengthen our country's military arm and that whatever program of controls which may be adopted during this emergency be a fair one—fairly administered—one which does not bring about inequities or discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, about the only thing I am sure of in connection with this particular amendment is that I can add nothing to the enlightenment of my colleagues by anything I might say about it. I do, however, for my own education on the subject want to address this question to the author of the amendment and likewise to someone like the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULLEN] who is strongly opposed to the amendment.

Is there any connection between the fixation of slaughtering quotas and the administration of the price-control program? I am anxious to avoid taking any action which can possibly have the effect of driving the price of meat to the consumer any higher than it is now. Perhaps this amendment has nothing to do with that question. It may relate solely to the elimination of black-market operators, also certainly a desirable objective, but as to which there is apparently considerable difference of opinion regarding the result of adopting the amendment. I recognize the gentleman from Kansas is opposed to the entire price-control program and I respect his views although I do not agree in all respects. Does the adoption or failure to adopt this amendment have anything to do with the administration of the price-control program?

Mr. HOPE. It is part of the administration of the price-control program.

Mr. KEATING. Is the fixation of quotas of assistance in the proper administration of a sound price-control program?

Mr. HOPE. That depends upon the viewpoint. Mr. DiSalle says it is. I think it is a detriment and a hindrance to the operation of such a program.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the gentleman's view is that it hinders the program rather than helps it?

Mr. HOPE. Certainly.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. PATMAN and Mr. DEANE was given to Mr. SPENCE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, most people should be in agreement that there are two things we want to do in relation to our situation on meat. We want to encourage maximum production, but on the other hand we want to get equitable distribution.

Now there is a fear about this quota which is totally unfounded. The OPS does not reach up into the blue and draw down a quota. The quota is based upon the movement of livestock to the market. The cattleman himself is the man who sets the quota. It works this way. Each month at the first of the month the Department of Agriculture estimates the cattle that are going to move to market in that given month. They adjust that estimate from time to time, every day or every few days or every week. If a lot of cattlemen move their stock into the market the quota goes up. If they do not move their stock into market the quota goes down. It is the cattleman himself who determines that quota. So we do not touch maximum production in this formulation of the quota, but what we do accomplish is to see that we have an equitable distribution. We have heard pleas by the slaughterhouses. If a slaughterhouse historically last year was butchering 10 cows and this year the same amount of cattle moves into market, he will be able to butcher the same 10 cows if we have this quota assignment. But if we do not have this quota assignment some larger outfit or some black marketeer can move in and take over the purchase and the established slaughterhouse will lose the quota that belongs to it. More than that, the community that is normally supplied by this slaughterhouse will be without meat.

This amendment should be voted down if maximum production and equitable distribution are to be obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart].

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Chairman, over the last 30 or more years I have marketed a few cattle each year. I have sold them as low as 3 cents a pound and have sold them as high as 43 cents a pound. This quota system is the most ridiculous thing I have ever run up against, and I marketed cattle under the OPA during the last war. Why in the

world, when there are more cattle in the country than there have been for years, and why in the world, when there are 5,000,000 more people in the United States than there were a year ago, we should limit the quota on cattle to 90 percent of the number sold last year, is beyond me to understand. It is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard. We have these cattle. The number of people have increased. We would like to furnish this meat to the people. Yet the OPS says that we cannot market more than 90 percent during the month of July. I checked that figure before I came into the well of the House. I sincerely hope the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas will prevail and that there will be an end to quotas.

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

Mr. D'Ewart. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Here are about 1,500 of the several thousand telegrams which have been pouring into my office this afternoon. Obviously my constituents are somewhat concerned about this issue. You can appreciate why I am so concerned and confused when every few minutes the Western Union boys are running themselves bowlegged with messages from my constituents. All these telegrams are on this issue of controls. In fact, my office staff is now burning the midnight oil keeping up with what is happening here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to close debate.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of reading the following notation in regard to beef parity:

Back in 1948 and 1949, run-away beef prices were pushing up the price parity ratio—based on the 1910-14 relationship between prices received and prices paid—well up toward 175 percent. Monthly calculations of the beef parity ratios were getting so high as to be scandalous. The beef lobby was concerned. Congress changed the base period for beef parity to the average of the preceding 10 years. These 10 years preceding 1951 are the very lush and profitable years of 1941-50. It is with these fat years used as a base of 100 that the new parity ratio rose to 152. Calculated on the old base, beef prices in April of this year stood at 205.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be an expert on the cattle industry. I think it is obvious that those who are opposed to the quota are opposed to any ceiling on beef. I hope I do not do any injustice to anybody in that respect. And it seems to me it is very obvious that all those who spoke against the quota were against a ceiling on beef.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield for a reply.

Mr. KEATING. No reply. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not yield for a question.

It is obvious that if you are going to have ceilings, and we admit that ceilings are obnoxious to people, but if you are going to have ceilings you must have some control. Quotas are the only means that I know of whereby you can control the slaughtering. If there is any other way of controlling it, I have not been informed of it. The regulation merely continues the historical pattern of beef slaughtering that is in existence now and that has continued for a long, long time.

Quotas are not looked upon as so unusual in this country. The tobacco growers vote quotas on themselves, because they feel it is for their benefit to have quotas.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOPE. I am going to ask the question if the Director of Price Stabilization does not have authority and power to punish violations of price ceilings and can use that power against every packer and every wholesaler and every retailer who violates the quotas?

Mr. SPENCE. He can if he catches them, but he will not have any way of finding them out unless he has some control over them. The evils that come from black marketing are more than just the evils of raising the price. They are the same character evils that come from bootlegging liquor. They are the evils that come from a disregard of the law. They are not only bad for our economy but they are bad for the morality of the people of the United States. It is not only essential that we prevent black markets because of the rise in prices of beef, but it is essential that we prevent them because of the bad effect they have on the morals of the American people.

I admit that the gentleman from Kansas has made a deeper study of this question than I with reference to slaughtering, but I think I can see the obvious. The gentleman from Kansas, of course, represents a great beef-producing country. I have no objection to his representing his people in that respect; I think it is natural that he should look out for their interests; we all do that. But there is another problem here; it is not a city program and it is not a country problem; it is the problem of fighting inflation, and it is the problem of seeing that the men, women, and children of America have sufficient food at fair prices; that is the problem that presents itself.

I represent a district that is half agricultural and half industrial, and I often want some help from the agricultural part of my State. The agricultural districts often need help from the cities to obtain legislation that will do them justice and I am sure you will agree with me when I say the city members seldom fail. I know that the people of my cities voted for parity; they voted for many things that the agricultural people wanted. We cannot divide this country into sections with prejudices one against the other, because it weakens, it weakens

us economically, it weakens us morally, it weakens us spiritually. There is no fight here between the country and the city; the question is: What is best for all of our people? What is best in this time of emergency which we hope may be over before long? What is best for all our people? Farming is the basic industry. The farmer feeds the American people. He is entitled to all the credit in the world for that; he is a great citizen; he has helped our country in time of peace and in time of war. But I think now he must make a sacrifice. No man has a right to profit because of the condition our country is in. They talk about the power of the Government; why, the Government can take your boy away from you and put him out on the hills of Korea and make him give up his life if need be. Then they talk about property rights. Property rights are very insignificant as compared to the authority to take the boys of America to fight for our country and our institutions. The Government has the right to regulate the slaughterers, and if there is any other way to do it except putting your hand on them and holding the control there I do not know what it is.

I hear men say that we do not need any controls; we need a free market. I have heard the President appeal to the people to use self-restraint and to agree to do the things they ought to do. Only the good obey the admonition; only the good obey those who ask them to do the things that are right. The bad will profit. There must be some controls, and it seems to me the most efficient way to control this great industry—I want to do it justice, I want to see that they make a profit—the only way to do it is to put your hand on them and say: "You shall have what you have had in past years; you shall have what the historical pattern entitles you to."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The other body in their wisdom adopted this amendment by a vote of 75 to 10 with the support of the majority and minority leaders. Were they wrong?

Mr. SPENCE. What the other body has done does not influence me. I will tell you what it does; it takes away all discretion from the House. We can just abdicate our function and let the other body dictate what we should do. Do you think that desirable. If you pass this Hope amendment that ends it; it goes into the law and there is no way of taking it out. I hope the House and this committee will not do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HOPE and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 200, noes 112.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, 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. 3871) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Mr. O'TOOLE. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped the Senate will give serious consideration to the budget of the Bureau of Customs for the coming fiscal year. Crippling amendments to the Treasury appropriation bill, adopted by the House on March 21, would hamper enforcement activities of the Customs agency. The House Appropriations Committee voted to strike \$800,000 from Budget Bureau figures for Customs and then the House itself voted an additional cut of \$675,000. These cuts were voted at a time when the need was never greater for funds to combat smuggling activities in the war on narcotics. Cuts made by the House were incorporated in spur-of-the-moment amendments as part of a general economy move and were ill-considered and ill-advised in view of the very obvious need for more Customs inspectors to combat the drug traffic.

The fact is the Bureau of Customs has long been hobbled by lack of adequate funds to carry on the work assigned to it. As import trade has increased, limitations under which Customs staffs have been forced to work have become more acute. Meantime, Customs receipts have been running more than 50 percent higher than during the previous year.

Narcotics Chief Anslinger, writing on the problem of teen-age dope addicts in the United States News and World Report of June 29, 1951, in answer to the question, Can Congress Help? said:

We would like to increase our force. And, of course, the Customs Bureau should be given additional guards.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from the New York Daily Mirror, the New York Herald Tribune, and the New York Journal of Commerce, which lend emphasis to the urgent need to strengthen enforcement activities of the Customs Bureau.

From the Daily Mirror of June 20, 1951:

United States Customs inspectors are raising a loud voice in militant opposition to

the Government's "penny wise and pound foolish" attitude in slicing Customs appropriations almost a million and a half. Already operating with an anemic force, the customs men believe our first line of defense against narcotics smuggling and other contraband debauching may be even more dangerously weakened by additional cuts in force and operations.

In addition to providing Uncle Sam's wall of protection, the customs men more than pay for themselves. They have already added more than \$446,000,000 to the United States Treasury via revenue collections for the current fiscal year, and their intake may run far in excess of \$600,000,000.

From the Herald Tribune of June 20, 1951:

NARCOTICS TRAFFIC—PERIL TO CUSTOMS PROTECTION SEEN IN APPROPRIATION CUT
To the New York Herald Tribune:

A basic fact is that the Customs Service is the first and only line of defense against the entrance of narcotics into this country. Excellent enforcement work is being done by the Bureau of Narcotics, and the various municipal and State police departments. All of these agencies, however, go to work after the narcotics have entered the country from abroad. It is only the vigilance of the Customs Service which prevents this scourge from overrunning the entire country. Unfortunately, the Customs Service has a pitiful few to hold back this invasion. Our borders have been all but stripped and there is not a single port that is not undermanned.

On March 21 the House of Representatives voted to cut the customs appropriations by \$675,000. This was in the face of the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee which had studied the bill for many weeks, and which had itself made a cut of \$800,000. If this total of \$1,475,000 is cut from the bill, the operations of the Customs Service will be severely handicapped. Customs is a revenue-producing agency. In addition to protecting the citizens of this country from contraband and narcotics, we collected nearly \$446,000,000 during the first 9 months of this fiscal year. It is estimated that for the full year the total will be in excess of \$600,000,000.

The curtailment of customs activities is a deadly serious matter. Economy in government is necessary and desirable. However, let us practice economy with reason by cutting where it is actually needed; not by opening wide the door to the dope smuggler's debauching traffic. We know that addiction, particularly among young people, has increased. We feel that this is so because the supply is plentiful, cheap and accessible. With the present personnel, customs is hamstrung in trying to do a complete enforcement job of stopping the dope before it enters the country. If the appropriation cut is allowed to stand, our association is of the opinion that the entire wall of customs protection will be dangerously weakened.

One of the facts established is that a principal source of revenue to the underworld is the narcotic traffic. We know that this traffic has been increasing. The smuggling of heroin, opium, morphine and marihuana has increased. The more we seize, the more attempts are made to smuggle dope in. It is frightening to know that, in many large cities, a "cap" of heroin can be bought as cheaply as marihuana.

JOHN J. MURPHY,
President, United States Customs
Inspectors' Association.
New York, June 17.

From the Import Bulletin published by the Journal of Commerce at New York:

We hope the Senate will show more sense than the House in the handling of the Customs Bureau's budget for the coming fiscal year. If it does not, importers can look forward to further vexations and costly delays at United States ports of entry.

The rub is not so much that the House Appropriations Committee voted to lop \$800,000 from President Truman's \$38,300,000 request for the Bureau, or even that the House itself then voted an additional cut of \$675,000. The total amount is not large, and a certain amount of judicious trimming is necessary wherever possible in the Government's nondefense budget.

But the trouble is that these cuts were voted at a time when the need is plainly for greater, not reduced, appropriations for the Customs Bureau. Moreover, they appear to have been made on the spur of the moment for reasons which were ill-considered if not actually foolish.

The Customs Bureau has long been hobbled by the lack of adequate funds to carry on the work assigned to it. This is a fact widely bemoaned in foreign-trade circles, and seemingly obvious to nearly everyone but Congress, the only body in a position to do anything about it.

As our import trade has increased, the limitations under which the port collectors are forced to work have become more and more painfully apparent. As far back as last September, customs clerks in the port of New York, who can normally be expected to process 50 entries a day, were struggling with an average of 103. Appraisers' stores were falling behind 200 to 600 cases a day, and approximately 43,000 uncompleted ledger statements were reported to have accumulated in the Divisions of Accounts and Entries. By the end of the year the backlog of unliquidated entries at this port stood at 274,000. Since then, by dint of hard work, the customs staff here is reported to have come abreast of the daily volume of entries. But its backlog has grown to 286,000. In the meantime, customs receipts have been running nearly 55 percent higher than during the previous fiscal year.

Why, then, has the House voted to cut the budget back to the level of the present fiscal year, which actually will buy \$500,000 less in man-hours because of salary increases in the Bureau?

Two chief reasons were given for this: one was that the Bureau had failed to hire 207 new employees it had been authorized to hire, the funds having been voted in January. The other was that the Bureau had failed to put into effect certain Treasury recommendations for streamlining procedure.

In the first instance, it appears that the 207 new workers were to have been taken on as of March 1, while the House check showing that none of them had been employed was made on February 8. Customs officials explain with some reason that they cannot find and process through civil-service channels all the right kind of employees all at once. Certainly they could have been given 3 months' grace.

Something of the same can be said of the second complaint—that Customs has not given sufficient attention to ways and means of improving its own performance. Actually, the Bureau has put several of the Treasury's recommendations into effect. Some others it still has under study. Still others it feels are impracticable and many would require enabling legislation.

But criticizing the Customs Bureau for failing to streamline its own machinery is like scolding a chauffeur for frequent breakdowns of a 1918 Stanley Steamer. What is needed, as we and many others have said

repeatedly, is a new machine, not a rubber-band and paper-clip patchwork job on the old one.

Congress has now had before it for 2 years a measure known as the Customs simplification bill which would provide the basis for the type of streamlined structure our Customs Bureau should be. This measure has the support of the major foreign trade organizations and of the Customs Bureau itself. But it has run into one snarl after another, and today seems no nearer passage than at this time a year ago.

It is much to be hoped that the responsible legislators will take a long hard look at the record of their own failure to take the first necessary step toward an efficient, up-to-date customs system. But so long as they seek to dodge the responsibility of providing an efficient machine, the least that can be expected of them is that they will provide the chauffeur with sufficient funds to keep the old one running.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to vacate her special order for today and to address the House for 5 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when the cotton-quota legislation was considered last year I had a good deal to say about what I conceived to be the final effects of that legislation so far as the distribution of income from cotton is concerned. Some people do not seem to be aware of the fact that when you limit acreage you limit bales and therefore you limit dollars. In effect, finally, it amounts to a method of distribution of dollars derived from the sale of cotton.

I pointed out at that time that in many instances where one county in a given State got 15 times as many acres as another county that did not represent the fact merely that that county's income from cotton was 15 times the income of the other county. I pointed out that in many instances the final figures translated into dollars would be much more. I have been able to collect some facts and figures from the Department of Agriculture. In one State, for example, and this is no isolated instance by any means, one county received some 2,600 allotments of cotton and another county in the same State received some 2,600 allotments of cotton.

The final income from cotton in one of the counties was under \$400,000 whereas the final income from cotton in the other county was \$27,000,000, just about 80 times as much. I questioned the justice of such a program at that time, and I question it even more vigorously today after seeing the figures. I say to the membership of the House as Emerson said, "Every excess brings on a defect, and every defect finally an excess."

We have some excesses and some defects in our farm program today. Finally everybody loses as a result of that sort of thing. As one who was born and reared on the farm, I recognize how important agriculture is to the people of this country. I yield to no one in my friendship for agriculture and our farmers. Many of my relatives earn their livings from agriculture and raising cattle today. But we must have fair and equitable programs. I have said this before to the membership of the House that when aid is sought in the Congress it is sought in the name of the farmer, but when the giving out takes place, too small a segment gets away with a too heavy percentage of the sum total of aid. Yes, we must undertake as the programs continue, to bring about more fairness and more justice and more equity and I ask and hope that the membership of the House will read carefully this very comprehensive study which has been prepared in regard to the distribution finally and actually of the income from cotton.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I was not in the last Congress, but I have read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I know of the fight that the gentleman made in behalf of the small cotton farmers of Texas and of the South generally. We all appreciate what the gentleman did when he was making his fight for the cotton farmers. My father-in-law had to plow up cotton. But this year a committee called on him and begged him to plant more cotton. I think the farmers of this country have common sense enough to know that we should raise cotton and there should not be such a great difference in the program from 1 year to another.

Somewhere along the line something is lacking. We appreciate what the gentleman has done and appreciate the efforts he is now putting forth in behalf of the cotton farmer.

Mr. BECKWORTH. They cut some of my people down to less than an acre. Some who had farmed and wish to farm could get no acreage. Some people who grew little more than one bale of cotton are compelled to pay heavy penalties to sell the cotton. This, I feel, is unwarranted.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I concur in what the gentleman has said, and compliment him highly on the fight he has made over a long period of time on this important matter. I also want to remind the gentleman that he supported an amendment which I offered during the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill for the measurement of cotton acreage in 1951, notwithstanding that we do not have cotton quotas. Is it not a fact that part of this dilemma came out of 1946, 1947, and 1948 when we did not have any records whatsoever and now looking forward to another year, since the policy program is still in effect and is still a matter of law, we are probably

going to have another such dilemma in the future if we do not have a measurement of acreage of 1951?

This morning I went before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on that particular matter. I welcome the gentleman's comment and the efforts he has made with reference to this program.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman has been a great deal of help on this problem. He was the author of an amendment which the House was considerate enough to adopt that should have the effect of helping bring about more order when we do have another allotment program. Judging from the very report that appeared in the paper this morning, in the writings of Mr. John Ball, of the Washington Post, it certainly looks like we are going to have quotas in the foreseeable future because he predicts the production of cotton may be probably 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 bales.

I am glad to see the Secretary of Agriculture recognizes this problem—the problem of the family-size farmer. He recently wrote me a letter in regard to the family-size farmer, and he welcomed from me, he stated, any observations that might be presented that would make strong the family-size farmer. I told him, among other things, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that one of the best things to do, when you invite people to grow a crop, particularly the small farmer, is to give them at least some acreage. That was not done in many instances. If they are given any acreage, give them enough to justify their growing a crop.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain data in connection with this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It should be borne in mind many people asked for allotments in 1950 who could not get them because they were classified as new farmers. A new farmer might be and often was one who had farmed many years, but because in 1950 he was not on a piece of land that had cotton on it in 1946, 1947, or 1948, he was legislated out of the cotton business by being called a new farmer.

It should be emphasized that many of the counties which received the least number of acres, had the least production, and the least number of dollars per allotment likewise had numerous tenant farmers. Thousands of these especially in the poor land counties received no cotton acreage or so little they could not afford to plant cotton.

When acres are limited, bales of cotton are limited, hence dollars are limited. Allotment of acres means ultimately allotment of dollars. The spread of "average dollars per allotment" as between the given counties in a given State is remarkable.

For example, each man receiving a cotton allotment in one Texas county sold an average of \$10,671.34 worth of cotton—a total of \$27,798,840—whereas each man in another Texas county sold an average of \$124.30—a total of \$334,980—worth of cotton which means the allotment in one Texas county is worth in

dollars more than 80 times what the allotment in another Texas county is worth. I seriously question the justness of such a situation. The former county—the one with the larger income—had 2,605 people receiving allotments whereas the latter county—the one with the smaller income—had 2,695 allotments. The latter county I might add has been growing cotton doubtless 100 years. The total income of the larger county is approximately 80 times the latter county, although the acreage allotted to the more fortunate county has only 14 times what the acreage in the less fortunate county was.

Farmers are told to grow truck crops and cattle when they cannot get cotton and peanut allotments, as is shown in the following letters:

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 to 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 oil) up to the 1947 picked and threshed will help at least 150 to 200 producers in Wood County. (I am told today, June 5, 1950, by Mr. Akers, that peanuts for edible purposes are worth \$200 to \$220 a ton and for oil purposes from \$100 to \$120 a ton.) [Part added in parentheses by LINDLEY BECKWORTH.]

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,

Secretary, Wood County PMA Committee.

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 was 340. (3) The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300. (4) Each producer received from 1 acre to 1.1 acres. (5) The number of zero allotments was 10. (6) The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 83 percent (300) applications.

The number of 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 of Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

De Ridder, La., May 22, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

Congress of the United States,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reference to your letter of May 18, 1950, listed below is a tabulation to your questionnaire.

Thank you for your interest in peanut and cotton farmers.

Very truly yours,

T. SHELBY OAKES,

Administrative Officer, Beauregard
Parish Production and Marketing
Administration.

Peanuts, 1950

Number of peanut producers.....	67
Number of peanut acres he can economically grow.....	5
Number of producers received allotment less than 5 acres.....	60
Number of producers received allotment less than 2 acres.....	47
Number of producers received less than 2 acres that will cease to grow peanuts.....	25
Number of producers that will cease to farm for themselves.....	--
Number of new producers applied for allotment in 1950.....	3
How many acres did you have to distribute.....	5.9
Approximately how much did they receive (all 3).....	5.9

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

De Ridder, La., June 1, 1950.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosure for your attention.

Yours very truly,

T. SHELBY OAKES,

Parish Administrative Officer,
County Committee of Beauregard Parish.

Cotton, 1950

1. Cotton producers in Beauregard Parish.....	307
2. Farmers receiving 5 acres or less of cotton.....	272
3. New producers applied for acreage.....	150
4. Acreage to distribute among new producers.....	415
5. Acreage each received.....	2.0-3.4
6. Farmers receiving zero acreage.....	13
7. Percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers.....	90
8. a. Acreage the new cotton amendment helped new producers.....	0
b. Old ones.....	0
9. Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that will probably grow no cotton.....	15
10. Number of farmers that will cease to farm for themselves.....	-----

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

Canton, Tex., March 20, 1950.

O. L. HAPTONSTALL,

Fruitvale, Tex.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise that the county committee finds it necessary to set up a zero allotment on the above farm serial number. Since we had 600 applications for new grower allotments and only 427.7 acres of cotton, you can see that the average allotment would have been 0.7 of an acre if all approved for allotments. The county committee approved 257 farms for new grower allotment with an average allotment of 1.7 acres. In view of the above facts we cannot see that you have been done any disservice by disapproval of your application.

Any appeal from the above must be made within 15 days from the date of this notice.

Your application was disapproved for one of the reasons set out below.

1. Work stock and equipment not available.
2. Has a cotton allotment on another farm.
3. Cotton allotment not necessary to livelihood of operator.
4. Land not adapted to production of cotton.
5. Allotment which could be set up too small to be of possible benefit to farm operator.

R. W. BROWN,
N. L. CHEATHAM,
J. M. STEPHENS,

County Committee, Van Zandt County
PMA.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Gilmer, Tex., November 17, 1950.

To: Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH.
From: Lewis E. Stracener, Jr., administrative officer, Upshur County PMA.
Subject: Reply to letter written to Mr. B. F. Vance, chairman State PMA committee in regard to complaint of Mr. Howard M. (Reece) Smith, route 1, Big Sandy, Tex., having difficulty with his cotton allotment.

Mr. Smith is operating a farm this year that did not have any cotton or war crop history for the years used in setting up cotton acreage allotment. Therefore, under the regulations this farm was considered a new farm for cotton allotment.

Mr. Smith filed an application for a new grower cotton allotment and received 4.2 acres cotton allotment out of the reserve set up for new growers. Mr. Smith planted 3.7 acres of cotton on farm.

I rather think Mr. Smith is complaining about 1950 peanut allotment. The farm Mr. Smith is operating has no 1950 peanut acreage allotment as farm has no past peanut history and he has 12.8 acres of peanuts planted on farm and intends to thresh and sell the peanuts which will be subject to the 5.4 cent penalty per pound, according to peanut marketing quota regulations.

Mr. Smith signed application for a new grower peanut allotment. County committee recommended a 5-acre peanut allotment when application was submitted to State PMA committee for approval. After review by State committee, a zero allotment was approved by State committee. However, the new grower peanut allotments amounted to nothing, since no new grower applicant received more than 0.6 acre, mostly 0.2 to 0.4 acre allotment.

LEWIS E. STRACENER, JR.,
Administrative Officer, Upshur County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Carthage, Tex., December 29, 1949.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of December 19, 1949, requesting certain data relative to cotton allotments in Panola County, Tex.

In comparing 1950 with 1942 allotments we note that Panola had an allotment of approximately 52,700 acres in 1942 and 17,367 for 1950. These figures include the allotment for new growers also.

You ask about release and reapportionment of unused cotton acreage allotment. We expect very few acres from this source. We estimate 150 for the county. Farmers anticipate changes in procedures and fear

that the surrender of cotton allotment may affect any future allotment that would be established on the farm.

We are in bad shape on new grower farms (those who did not grow cotton in any of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948); 1,300 such farms, and only 1,000 acres to distribute. Of this 1,300, at least 400 will apply for a portion of this acreage.

I hesitate to estimate the number of tenants that will be without homes as a result of the small allotments in this county. The big move will start in the spring and after Congress has considered giving some relief. They still have hopes that something better will come their way. No doubt the gentleman from Wills Point, Tex., was about right in his estimates. For example, in Panola County, in 1942, 0.3145 percent of the cropland was allowed for cotton, while in 1950 only 0.1398 percent is allowed.

We appreciate your interest and will gladly furnish any additional information upon request.

With kindest regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

T. L. VINCENT,
Administrative Officer, PMA, Panola
County, Tex.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Tex., January 18, 1950.
MR. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Henderson County reserved 1,450 acres of its official county allotment, all but 334 acres were used in adjusting 5- to 15-acre and other farms.

The chief concern of the committee is new-grower allotments as you see we only have 334 acres for this purpose, which will only be a drop in the bucket when distributed among 1,000 new growers.

We think you could relieve the situation in east Texas if you could get a price support on dry black-eyed and cream peas. Understand the State of California has one on black-eyed beans, which is the same as our peas.

The county committee concurs with Houston County in that the amendment will not help this county if we have to use the BAE acreage for the country. I am enclosing copy of a letter we sent TOM PICKETT.

If we can be of further help, please advise.
Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND G. MAGERS,
Chairman, PMA Committee of Hen-
derson County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 3, 1950.
MR. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of a few days ago, in which you requested information relative to the cotton allotment situation in Smith County, the following is submitted:

1. 1942 Smith County cotton allotment: 58,000 acres.
2. Number of acres we would have to redistribute if the unused 1950 allotment could be used. It is estimated that about 1,000 acres would be released by farmers for redistribution.
3. Number of acres that would come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of too little acreage. It is doubtful if any acres would be released by

such farmers, as they would merely reduce the number of tenants on the farm, so that a reasonable crop could be had by each tenant.

4. War crop credit: Smith County would receive about 3,000 additional acres if this credit were granted.

5. Number of genuine cotton farmers that will be forced to quit farming in Smith County due to the 1950 cotton-allotment formula (including tenants). It is estimated that at least 500 will be forced off of farms due to insufficient cotton acreage.

Hoping this to be the desired information, and should additional information be needed don't fail to call on us.

For the county committee:

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

They grow tomatoes, but then are told the following:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., June 25, 1951.
MRS. ROY DENTON,
Troup, Tex.

DEAR MRS. DENTON: Your letter of June 19 to the Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Congressman, Third District of Texas, has been referred to me.

I regret very much that we have no price support on fresh tomatoes. We fully understand that the price is very low and that farmers are not realizing the cost of production from the crop. I certainly hope that the market improves and that the producers will receive a fair return for the crop.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.
(Copy to LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Congress-
man.)

Note the article from the Kilgore Herald of June 17, 1951:

EAST TEXAS TOMATO GROWERS DENIED AID

WASHINGTON.—East Texas tomato farmers, faced with a bumper crop and low prices, aren't in line for such help because they overplanted, the Agriculture Department says.

Under Secretary C. J. McCormick in a letter to Senator CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas), said Texas growers, spurred by high prices in 1950, went against the Department's suggestions as to the acreage to be planted in tomatoes this year.

McCormick continued that laws governing purchases of surplus commodities require the Department consider whether farmers complied with suggested acreage limits.

"Therefore," he continued, "it has been our policy to deny assistance to vegetable growers in those areas substantially exceeding the Department's suggested acreage."

"The east Texas tomato producing area substantially exceeded our acreage suggestions."

He said the east Texas tomato acreage this year was 25 percent above 1950, and the estimated yield was 47 percent greater.

Another reason for the depressed market prices and slow movement of the crop in east Texas, McCormick explained, was the lateness of tomatoes maturing this year in the Rio Grande Valley. Freezes there caused a second planting, and a resulting overlapping in tomato crops from the two primary producing sections of Texas.

He added, however, that shipments from the Rio Grande Valley are declining and most of the remainder of the crop there will go to the canning factories. As a result, he said, "with less competition from other areas and improved quality of their own product, growers in east Texas should soon experience a more favorable market."

The farmers grow sweetpotatoes, but the following develops:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

College Station, Tex., November 7, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: You will find enclosed copy of final report of sweetpotato program RMP-25a-74 which was terminated November 3. You will note that only 500 bushels of potatoes were purchased.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter to Mr. J. L. Harris, route 1, Gladewater, Tex., and one to Mr. N. E. Dudley, of Whitehouse, Smith County Tex., giving them information we have regarding shipments of sweetpotatoes from quarantined areas.

I want you to know that I appreciated the visit with you, and it is regretted that we were not able to help the farmers in your area. In summing up the potato situation up there this year and with the interest of the farmer at heart, you cannot blame the farmer for not selling his potatoes to the Government at a price we offered as most of the farmers were only getting 25 to 40 percent U. S. No. 1 potatoes off of their land and the actual cost to them runs at least \$75.00 per acre and the farmers felt that they had rather hold, taking a chance on a better market instead of taking a \$25.00 per acre loss on their potatoes.

The market is stronger and has improved some. I think the cooperative advertising has helped some. Assuring you of our cooperation, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

DENNIS M. POE,
Purchase Representative.

The farmers are told to grow cattle, but then comes the roll-back. Note these 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 well 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, lariet 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.

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.

MINNEOLA, 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 stock raisers.

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 foggy 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 1949 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.

One then can easily understand why the Department of Agriculture is studying family-farm problems. Note Mr. McCormick's letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: During recent months it has become abundantly clear that our United States pattern of land tenure and family farming should be used as an American export of hope in our world-wide struggle against Communist expansion. But if democracy is to be a continuing source of hope to rural people elsewhere in the world, democracy must continue to advance in our own rural areas—we must hold the mirror up to ourselves. Secretary Brannan and I feel strongly the need for all farm organizations and public institutions concerned with agriculture to unite in a definite, vigorous program to strengthen family farming in America.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the steps we are taking in that direction.

With the aid of representatives from farm and church organizations and the land-grant colleges, we have initiated a Nationwide study of the Department's policies and programs with a view to determining (1) programs already well adapted to the need of family farmers, including the making of their greatest contribution to defense production at a minimum of cost for the services rendered; (2) programs which should be discontinued; and (3) programs and policies which should be changed to adapt them to family farm needs in the mobilization period.

As the first step in this review, at the request of the Secretary there has been created a family farm policy review committee made up of agricultural leaders from outside the Department as well as Department people. We invited each of the major farm and church organizations to designate representatives to participate in this committee. Under the committee's supervision, task groups were assigned to make preliminary reviews of programs and policies of each agency, which have now been consolidated into a provisional report and tentative recommendations to be used as a basis for the most widespread study and discussion we can obtain.

Copies of the provisional report are being made available in every county in the United States, with the assistance of farm and church groups requested in obtaining its widespread consideration through neighborhood meetings and discussion groups.

We have asked our State and county agricultural mobilization committees to act as

clearinghouses for getting reports and recommendations from farmers and farm groups during the next few months, but have also invited farm and church groups to consider and make recommendations on the policy review in any way they see fit.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of the provisional report, a copy of a pamphlet entitled "The Family Farm's Future" that explains our purpose in this review, together with a copy of the agricultural mobilization memorandum setting forth procedures for carrying out the policy review at the State and county levels.

I want to emphasize that the report is intended merely as a starting point for the widest possible consideration and discussion by farmers and farm groups throughout the Nation. From such discussion we hope to evolve final recommendations reflecting the broadest possible cross section of the opinions and ideas of American farmers themselves.

We believe such an appraisal will make a valuable and constructive contribution to the future guidance of the Department, and to the eventual formulation of improved national policies for the well-being of American agriculture.

Both the Secretary and I will welcome any suggestions you may care to make toward furtherance of such objectives.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

In answering the Secretary's letter asking for suggestions about keeping strong our family-size farm units, I suggested to him through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A3990, of the Appendix, the following. I might add I shall welcome his comments.

Mr. Speaker, among other things I hope to write the Secretary later, I would say to the Secretary and Mr. McCormick that many of these farmers referred to are not new farmers. Also I say to them when there are allotments, give these small farmers enough acreage to justify growing the given crops as I proposed August 3, 1949, on pages 10723 and 10728, volume 95, part 8, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

"The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Page 16, line 3, after the period insert the following subsection:

"(f) The penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total acreage does not exceed 5 acres."

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

"Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some of the Members who are sponsoring this bill this question. It is in the form of an assumption, but I think a very real assumption.

"Assume that a veteran 25 or 26 years of age never did anything except grow cotton on a cotton farm until 1942 when he went into the Army; assume he remained in the Army until 1946; assume that he took GI training to be a mechanic, for 2 years, and while doing so he did not farm; assume that he owns a 60-acre cotton farm which has had no cotton on it since 1942; assume that today he loses his job and goes back to that cotton farm which has not had cotton grown on it since 1942. The question is: Will he be privileged to get 5 acres of cotton?

"Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

"Mr. PACE. That depends, and I have tried to explain it to the gentleman, that depends entirely upon the State PMA Committee of the State of Texas, and the county PMA

committee in which that farm is located. He can, and will very likely get considerably more than 5 acres. It depends upon the amount of acreage the State committee allocates to that county for new farms. If the State committee gives the county, for example, 500 acres for new farms every acre of it must go to new farms. Then, in addition to that 500 acres, the county committee may reserve 10 percent that can be used for new farms. So the allotment could be identical with like farms in the same area.

"Mr. BECKWORTH. May I ask this further question: However, is it true or it is not true that the definite 5-acre minimum applies to him?

"Mr. PACE. It does not."

Mr. Speaker, apparently others feel the same way.

"[From the Farmer-Stockman of November 1950]

"TALKS WITH OUR READERS

"(By Ferdie J. Deering, editor)

"The futility of Government attempts to control crop production through acreage allotments is demonstrated again in the 1950 cotton-crop failure. So, for 1951 at least, there won't be any acreage controls on the cotton crop.

"The breakdown of the allotment system might be glossed over by designating last spring's 'cotton surplus' as '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."

"COUNTRY GENTLEMAN,

Philadelphia, March 1, 1951.

"HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BECKWORTH: Thank you for letting us see the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD telling of Mr. Spivey's experience with the PMA. There ought to be an exemption of 5 acres, to take care of the little farmers, in any future allotment programs.

"Sincerely yours,

"E. H. TAYLOR."

"SOUTHWESTERN CROP AND STOCK,
Lubbock, Tex., March 10, 1951.

"HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BECKWORTH: The H. R. Spivey case is perhaps only one of hundreds so affected. It bespeaks an unjust situation. Your proposal of a 5-acre exemption is favorable. My opinion is that it should be considered a bare minimum exemption in any future allotment programs.

"We appreciate your sending us the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and asking our opinion in the matter.

"Yours very truly,

"RAYMOND LEE JOHNS,
Publisher."

Among other suggestions I, in this manner, submit to the Secretary of Agriculture this one: Make a similar study to the one I herewith include concerning cotton for all crops subject to or likely to become subject to controls.

Also I suggest to the Secretary that he diligently seek to get accurate figures for his Washington office as to where the Federal money is going in the cases where given crops are being supported in any manner. If this is done, in my opinion, a wiser use of the Federal dollar for price support of crops will take place. I refer specifically to the five pages of communications which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1951.

Also I suggest that no effort be made to prevent information being obtained as to allotments. I judge this type of instruction was sent to many counties:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Gainesville, Fla., May 9, 1950.

SPECIAL LETTER TO COTTON COUNTIES

To: PMA secretaries, administrative officers, and chief clerks in cotton counties.

From: R. S. Dennis, executive officer.

Subject: Inquiry from Congressman BECKWORTH.

We have just received the following telegram from Mr. Frank K. Woolley, Deputy Administrator, PMA:

"Instruct county offices to delay until further advised replying to Congressman BECKWORTH's letter to counties asking 11 questions with respect to cotton under Public Law 471."

Please comply with the instructions from the Deputy Administrator in this connection.

ASH FLAT, ARK., May 10, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.:

In regard to information requested by the county PMA office, we were ready to mail reply when orders came not to reply until otherwise notified.

As I am on the county committee, I am also writing to try to find out where the orders to withhold came from and what authority they had to issue the order to withhold anything from anyone, as all records should be open to the public at any time.

I hope to be able to furnish the information soon.

Very truly yours,

ROBY SOUTHAARD.

My good friend, Mr. Vance, says he feels we should have as many family size farms as possible.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., June 21, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your letter of June 8, in which you quoted parts of two letters, one from Madisonville and one from Wills Point, Tex.

I do not have much comment to make in connection with these statements; however, I am of the opinion that the fact that peo-

ple are leaving the farm is not altogether bad. We have made progress in this country by increasing our production through the use of technology, and it does not require so many people to produce the raw products. At the present time it takes only about 10 percent of our people to produce the raw products, whereas in many other countries it takes 80 percent. We have the many conveniences, such as electricity, radio, television, cars, airplanes, good roads, and good churches and schools because we have been able to release people from the production of raw agricultural products.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not at all for corporation farming. I think we should have as many family size farms as is possible; however, it is my opinion that many of the farms in East Texas have been too small for a family to make a good living on. Just what size the farm should be is very difficult to determine, and, of course, that depends on whether the producer grows beef cattle, dairy cattle, or intensely cultivates crops such as potatoes, tomatoes, and vegetables.

I fully recognize that there are many people dissatisfied with the present administration; however, many of these dissatisfied people fail to understand the objectives of the present programs being administered, and, of course, these programs do work hardships on individuals. As I have discussed with you before, I am a firm believer in local administration. I think the laws enacted by Congress and administered by Government agencies should leave a great deal of latitude to the local people, for I believe local people selected by their neighbors are in a better position to administer justice in hardship cases than we can possibly have under any set of rules or regulations.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,

Chairman, State PMA Committee.

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama:								Alabama—Con.							
Antauga.....	1,183	15,608	5,788	\$1,041,840	13.194	4.893	\$880.68	Houston.....	2,764	33,326	14,186	\$2,553,480	12.057	5.132	\$923.84
Barbour.....	1,702	18,813	5,515	992,700	11.053	3.240	583.25	Jackson.....	4,254	43,761	9,544	1,717,920	10.287	2.244	404.22
Bibb.....	774	6,716	2,456	442,080	8.677	3.173	571.16	Lamar.....	2,424	20,928	7,397	1,331,460	8.634	3.052	549.28
Blount.....	4,017	32,397	8,562	1,541,160	8.065	2.131	383.66	Lauderdale.....	3,971	48,569	16,324	2,938,320	12.231	4.111	739.94
Bulloch.....	815	16,139	4,056	730,080	9.802	4.977	895.80	Lawrence.....	3,183	61,337	27,292	4,912,560	19.270	8.574	1,543.37
Butler.....	1,856	14,848	5,058	910,440	8.000	2.725	490.54	Lee.....	1,183	14,435	5,673	1,021,140	12.202	4.795	863.18
Calhoun.....	1,803	14,637	2,845	512,100	8.118	1.578	284.03	Limestone.....	3,491	68,656	36,331	6,539,580	19.666	10.407	1,873.27
Chambers.....	1,416	19,543	8,265	1,487,700	13.802	5.837	1,050.64	Lowndes.....	823	17,495	4,925	886,500	21.258	5.984	1,077.16
Cherokee.....	2,142	35,917	15,809	2,845,620	16.768	7.380	1,328.49	Macon.....	1,616	25,558	9,950	1,791,000	15.816	6.157	1,108.29
Chilton.....	2,622	16,223	5,315	956,700	6.187	2.027	364.87	Madison.....	3,500	87,430	44,302	7,974,360	24.980	12.658	2,278.39
Choctaw.....	1,638	8,325	1,932	347,760	5.082	1.179	212.31	Marengo.....	1,951	28,330	9,116	1,640,880	14.521	4.672	841.05
Clarke.....	1,094	7,434	1,822	327,960	4.388	1.076	193.60	Marion.....	3,381	25,222	8,089	1,456,020	7.460	2.392	430.65
Clay.....	1,744	9,847	2,182	392,760	5.646	1.251	225.21	Marshall.....	5,015	52,687	17,716	3,188,880	10.506	3.507	635.87
Cleburne.....	1,192	8,540	1,313	236,340	7.164	1.102	198.27	Monroe.....	2,176	25,096	7,412	1,334,160	11.533	3.406	613.13
Coffee.....	2,088	24,717	9,647	1,736,460	11.838	4.620	831.64	Montgomery.....	1,171	19,249	5,757	1,036,260	16.438	4.916	884.94
Colbert.....	1,990	36,135	17,133	3,083,940	18.158	8.610	1,649.72	Morgan.....	4,125	48,774	19,690	3,544,200	11.824	4.773	859.20
Conecun.....	2,387	15,755	5,395	971,100	6.600	2.290	406.83	Perry.....	1,215	18,777	5,851	1,053,180	15.454	4.816	866.81
Coosa.....	988	4,073	770	138,600	4.122	1.779	140.28	Pickens.....	2,295	26,682	7,430	1,337,400	11.626	3.237	582.75
Covington.....	2,691	22,233	8,888	1,599,840	8.262	3.303	594.52	Pike.....	1,601	26,268	7,727	1,390,860	24.758	4.826	868.74
Crenshaw.....	1,644	17,902	5,540	997,200	10.889	3.370	606.67	Randolph.....	2,714	20,443	6,915	1,244,700	7.532	2.448	458.62
Cullman.....	6,829	61,493	23,234	4,182,120	9.003	3.402	612.41	Russell.....	831	16,297	4,297	773,460	19.611	5.171	930.76
Dale.....	1,341	10,563	3,378	608,040	7.936	2.519	453.42	St. Clair.....	1,878	12,779	2,529	455,220	6.905	1.347	242.40
Dallas.....	1,634	40,331	11,736	2,112,480	24.682	7.182	1,292.83	Shelby.....	971	9,305	2,966	539,280	9.583	3.085	555.39
De Kalb.....	6,034	55,395	15,109	2,719,620	9.180	2.604	450.72	Sumter.....	1,238	22,878	6,872	1,236,960	18.480	5.551	999.16
Elmore.....	2,240	26,818	12,272	2,208,960	11.972	5.470	1,002.25	Talladega.....	2,282	24,168	5,750	1,035,000	10.591	2.320	452.55
Escambia.....	1,588	12,330	5,813	1,046,340	8.394	3.661	658.90	Tallapoosa.....	1,545	14,057	5,314	856,520	9.098	3.459	619.11
Etowah.....	3,044	25,266	5,506	991,080	8.300	1.809	325.58	Tuscaloosa.....	3,264	30,546	10,845	1,952,100	9.358	3.323	568.07
Fayette.....	2,392	16,879	4,539	891,020	7.056	1.898	341.56	Walker.....	3,259	16,086	3,233	581,940	4.936	.992	178.56
Franklin.....	2,648	25,531	6,779	1,220,220	9.642	2.560	460.81	Wilcox.....	1,433	18,631	4,336	780,480	12.822	2.984	537.15
Geneva.....	2,116	25,153	13,613	2,450,340	11.887	6.433	1,158.01	Winston.....	2,282	15,710	4,010	721,800	6.884	1.757	316.30
Greene.....	1,342	21,453	6,258	1,126,440	15.986	4.063	839.37								
Hale.....	1,814	24,170	9,280	1,670,400	13.324	5.116	920.84								
Henry.....	1,322	19,406	8,352	1,503,360	14.679	6.318	1,137.19								
								Total.....	142,586	1,605,069	565,939	102,771,000	11.652	3.989	383.64

1 Rounded to nearest thousand.

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Arkansas:							
Arkansas.....	1,430	13,028	6,841	\$1,231,380	9.110	4,784	\$877.68
Ashley.....	1,057	29,007	20,430	3,677,400	27.443	19,329	3,479.09
Bradley.....	1,206	10,107	2,376	427,680	8.381	1,970	354.63
Calhoun.....	839	7,780	1,639	295,020	9.273	1,954	351.63
Chicot.....	1,729	45,230	23,027	4,144,860	26.160	13,318	2,397.26
Clark.....	1,148	12,818	1,591	286,380	11.166	1,386	249.46
Clay.....	3,544	48,408	24,746	4,454,280	13.559	6,983	1,256.85
Cleveland.....	1,184	9,460	2,523	454,140	7.990	2,131	383.56
Columbia.....	2,732	24,717	5,916	1,064,880	9.047	2,165	389.78
Conway.....	1,951	21,453	2,542	457,560	10.996	1,303	224.53
Craighead.....	4,032	85,578	56,725	10,210,500	21.225	14,069	2,532.37
Crittenden.....	1,728	110,764	94,939	17,089,020	64.100	54,942	9,889.48
Cross.....	1,536	44,561	36,968	6,654,240	29.011	24,068	4,332.19
Desha.....	1,582	58,074	36,688	6,603,840	36.709	23,191	4,174.36
Drew.....	1,474	19,986	9,653	1,737,540	13.559	6,549	1,178.79
Faulkner.....	2,907	33,254	6,676	1,201,680	11.439	2,301	413.37
Grant.....	688	3,159	575	103,500	4.592	836	150.44
Greene.....	3,521	46,691	23,236	4,182,480	13.261	6.60	1,187.87
Hempstead.....	2,510	28,668	4,819	867,420	11.422	1,920	345.59
Howard.....	951	8,111	1,246	224,280	8.529	1,310	235.84
Independence.....	1,584	16,695	2,460	442,800	10.540	1,553	279.55
Izard.....	1,408	9,433	360	64,800	6.700	256	46.02
Jackson.....	1,672	65,419	34,235	6,162,300	39.126	20,475	3,685.59
Jefferson.....	1,904	91,457	65,012	11,702,190	48.034	34,145	6,146.09
Lafayette.....	1,122	22,582	9,628	1,733,040	20.127	8,581	1,544.00
Lawrence.....	2,121	34,453	12,732	2,291,760	6.244	6,003	1,080.51
Lee.....	2,348	69,975	48,502	8,730,360	29.802	20,637	3,718.21
Lincoln.....	1,468	47,313	29,117	5,241,060	32.300	10,834	3,570.20
Little River.....	752	13,300	3,447	608,460	17.686	4,584	825.08
Lonoke.....	2,830	70,131	36,011	6,488,180	24.781	12,580	2,264.37
Miller.....	1,122	24,187	5,460	982,800	21.557	4,866	875.94
Mississippi.....	3,399	228,713	160,970	28,974,600	67.290	47,358	8,524.45
Monroe.....	1,711	40,670	25,726	4,630,680	33.770	15,056	2,706.42
Nevada.....	1,620	14,170	1,723	319,140	8.747	1,094	197.00
Onuchita.....	911	7,287	1,072	183,960	7.999	1,122	201.93
Phillips.....	2,605	90,261	51,964	9,353,520	34.626	19,948	3,590.60
Poinsett.....	2,072	96,376	76,511	13,771,980	46.514	36,922	6,046.71
Pope.....	1,266	11,318	1,022	183,960	8.940	807	145.31
Prairie.....	1,263	15,035	8,311	1,495,980	11.904	6,580	1,184.47
Pulaski.....	1,194	32,504	13,851	2,493,180	27.223	11,601	2,088.09
Randolph.....	1,636	20,008	4,917	—885,060	12.230	3,006	540.99
St. Francis.....	1,911	86,342	68,105	12,258,900	45.182	35,638	6,414.91
Sharp.....	1,142	9,631	975	175,500	84.327	854	163.68
Union.....	1,219	8,003	893	160,740	6.565	733	131.86
White.....	4,429	45,658	10,610	1,909,800	10.309	2,294	431.20
Woodruff.....	1,371	48,434	27,142	4,885,560	35.302	19,797	5,563.50
Yell.....	1,319	17,052	3,407	613,260	12.928	2,583	464.94
Total.....	85,148	1,897,201	1,066,909	191,118,000	21.004	11,128	2,049.71
Arizona:							
Graham.....	499	15,664	27,103	4,878,540	31.391	54,315	9,776.63
Maricopa.....	1,944	91,395	183,442	33,019,590	47.014	94,393	6,985.37
Pima.....	66	11,159	25,102	4,518,360	109.076	380,333	8,460.00
Pinal.....	1,037	117,561	220,555	39,699,900	113.366	212,689	8,283.41
Total.....	3,546	235,779	506,202	82,116,360	90.219	185,428	8,376.35
California:							
Fresno.....	3,660	178,170	288,604	51,964,920	48.680	78,878	14,198.07
Kern.....	2,100	165,402	291,297	52,433,400	78.763	138,713	14,968.31
Kings.....	1,080	91,191	126,355	22,743,900	84.436	116,995	21,059.17
Madera.....	1,260	52,749	58,613	10,550,340	41.864	46,518	8,373.29
Merced.....	3722	22,879	29,603	5,328,540	61.503	79,578	14,324.03
Tulare.....	3,972	129,032	180,505	32,490,900	32.485	45,444	8,179.98
Total.....	12,444	739,423	975,067	175,512,060	57.955	78.36	51,410.42
Georgia:							
Baldwin.....	414	4,495	1,712	308,160	10.857	4,135	744.38
Banks.....	949	7,450	2,612	470,160	7.850	2,752	495.43
Barrow.....	1,045	12,413	3,877	697,860	11.878	3,710	667.81
Bartow.....	1,248	24,789	10,035	1,805,300	19.863	8,041	1,447.36
Ben Hill.....	549	6,076	1,811	325,980	11.067	3,299	593.77
Bleckley.....	583	10,301	5,827	1,048,890	17.669	9,965	1,799.07
Brooks.....	1,272	8,284	3,613	650,340	6.512	2,840	511.27
Bulloch.....	1,770	22,008	9,640	1,735,200	12.773	5,446	980.34
Burke.....	1,414	49,753	17,843	3,211,740	35.188	12,619	2,271.39
Butts.....	483	8,983	3,531	635,580	18.598	7,311	1,315.90
Calhoun.....	353	5,526	2,650	477,000	16.564	7,507	1,351.27
Candler.....	595	8,543	4,334	780,120	14.358	7,284	1,311.13
Carroll.....	2,605	25,759	5,689	1,024,020	9.888	2,184	393.10
Chattooga.....	1,200	10,133	1,061	190,980	11.014	1,163	207.69
Cherokee.....	1,289	6,911	3,175	31,500	5.392	1,236	24.44
Clarke.....	506	4,510	1,358	239,040	8.913	2,625	472.41
Cobb.....	1,439	9,195	3,190	55,800	6.390	215	38.78
Coffee.....	1,128	8,422	2,496	449,280	7.466	2,213	398.30
Colquitt.....	1,773	19,322	12,346	2,222,280	10.808	6,963	1,263.40
Coweta.....	1,139	14,508	4,896	881,280	12.737	4,299	773.73
Crisp.....	628	11,999	5,759	1,036,620	19.107	9,170	1,650.67
Dodge.....	1,340	19,917	8,726	1,570,680	14.863	6,512	1,172.16
Dooley.....	1,063	23,846	10,821	1,947,780	22.433	10,180	1,832.34
Early.....	1,158	15,753	7,392	1,330,560	13.604	6,353	1,149.02
Georgia—Con.							
Elbert.....	1,463	17,167	5,762	\$1,037,160	11.740	3,938	\$708.93
Emanuel.....	1,415	23,580	8,379	1,508,220	16.664	5,922	1,065.88
Fayette.....	802	10,725	3,564	641,520	13.370	4,444	790.90
Floyd.....	1,403	19,294	3,954	654,480	13.752	2,592	466.44
Forsyth.....	1,466	10,971	656	118,080	7.484	447	80.55
Franklin.....	1,642	16,791	6,831	1,229,580	10.226	4,160	748.83
Fulton.....	1,001	8,303	1,184	213,120	8.375	1,183	212.90
Glascok.....	361	7,613	2,146	386,280	21.089	5,945	1,070.03
Gordon.....	1,599	18,443	4,598	827,640	11.534	2,876	517.60
Greene.....	776	8,175	1,757	310,260	10.535	2,264	407.55
Gwinnett.....	2,007	17,789	2,593	466,740	3.885	1,262	232.56
Hall.....	1,555	11,257	883	158,940	7.239	568	102.21
Hancock.....	961	13,340	3,972	714,960	13.881	4,133	743.98
Haralson.....	1,231	8,376	1,159	208,620	6.804	942	160.47
Harris.....	491	4,113	1,502	270,360	8.377	3,059	550.631
Hart.....	1,643	22,282	8,732	1,571,760	13.562	5,315	956.64
Henry.....	1,245	20,303	7,867	1,416,060	16.308	6,319	1,137.40
Houston.....	565	8,941	3,257	586,290	15.825	5,705	1,037.63
Irwin.....	855	11,108	5,062	1,008,360	13.092	6,552	1,179.37
Jackson.....	1,506	21,620	8,128	1,463,040	14.356	5,397	971.47
Jasper.....	423	8,255	3,321	597,780	19.515	7,851	1,413.19
Jefferson.....	1,149	28,714	10,158	1,828,440	24.960	8,841	1,591.33
Jenkins.....	694	16,622	6,009	1,200,420	23.951	9,610	1,729.71
Johnson.....	848	21,421	9,004	1,620,720	25.261	10,018	1,911.23
Lamar.....	513	5,540	1,745	314,100	10.799	3,402	612.28
Laurens.....	2,100	39,054	17,880	3,218,400	17.997	8,240	1,483.13
Lowndes.....	791	3,594	1,263	227,700	4.544	1,599	287.86
McDuffie.....	564	10,931	3,823	688,140	19.381	6,778	1,815.32
Macon.....	693	17,826	6,989	1,258,020	25.723	10,085	2,515.32
Madison.....	1,517	17,343	7,900	1,422,000	11.332	5,208	937.38
Meriwether.....	1,157	18,520	8,644	1,555,920	16.067	7,471	1,344.79
Mitchell.....	1,086	13,237	6,061	1,090,980	1.312	601	108.12
Montgomery.....	518	6,124	2,237	402,660	11.822	4,319	777.34
Morgan.....	795	21,899	10,868	1,956,240	27.546	13,670	2,460.68
Murray.....	934	7,902	885	159,300	8.460	948	170.55
Newton.....	808	13,707	5,199	935,820	16.964	6,434	1,158.19
Oconee.....	728	11,708	5,057	910,260	16.082	6,946	1,250.36
Oglethorpe.....	1,193	13,897	4,586	825,480	11.649	3,844	691.94
Paulding.....	1,081	9,946	1,406	253,080	9.201	1,301	234.12
Pike.....	643	11,287	4,089	736,020	17.554	6,359	1,144.67
Polk.....	1,323	13,589	2,328	419,040	10.271	1,760	316.73
Pulaski.....	544	11,186	5,103	918,540	20.562	9,381	1,688.49
Richmond.....	347	4,723	1,261	226,980	13.611	3,634	654.12
Rockdale.....	565	7,180	1,806	325,080	12.708	3,196	575.36
Schley.....	299	5,772	2,572	462,960	19.304	8,602	1,548.36
Screven.....	1,308	24,851	9,436	1,698,480	18.999	7,214	1,298.53
Spalding.....	608	6,951	2,354	423,720	13.683	4,634	834.09
Sumter.....	784	14,382	7,438	1,338,840	18.344	9,487	1,707.70
Taliaferro.....	387	4,456	1,028	185,040	11.514	2,656	478.14
Tattnall.....	980	7,593	2,259	406,620	7.748	2,305	414.92
Taylor.....	568	10,242	4,093	736,740	18.682	7,206	1,297.08
Telfair.....	859	7,096	2,145	386,100	8.261	2,497	449.48
Terrell.....	555	13,623	7,506	1,351,080	24.546	13,524	2,434.38
Thomas.....	824	5,098	1,796	323,280	6.187	2,180	392.33

¹ Rounded to nearest thousand.

² Total value calculated on the basis of 36 cents per pound.

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Louisiana—Con.							
Pointe Coupee.....	1,090	13,334	6,275	\$1,129,500	12.233	5.757	\$1,036.24
Rapides.....	1,588	20,042	14,455	2,601,900	12.621	9.103	1,638.48
Red River.....	921	22,279	9,189	1,654,020	24.190	8.891	1,795.90
Richland.....	2,000	54,260	29,710	5,347,800	27.130	14.855	2,673.90
Sabine.....	1,329	7,767	1,174	211,320	5.844	.883	159.01
St. Landry.....	4,055	48,158	23,300	4,194,000	11.876	5.746	1,034.28
St. Martin.....	1,632	12,537	5,732	1,031,760	7.682	3.512	632.21
Tensas.....	689	25,251	16,264	2,927,520	36.649	23.605	4,248.94
Union.....	1,864	16,870	3,265	587,700	9.050	1.752	315.29
Vermilion.....	2,284	15,293	4,838	870,840	6.696	2.118	381.28
Washington.....	1,628	11,422	3,047	548,460	7.016	1.872	336.89
Webster.....	1,422	15,997	3,749	674,820	11.250	2.636	474.57
West Carroll.....	2,080	30,372	17,670	3,180,600	14.602	8.495	1,523.13
Winn.....	613	3,358	363	65,340	5.478	.592	106.59
Total.....	54,270	877,503	407,689	338,840,200	16.517	8.407	1,473.57
Mississippi:							
Adams.....	336	5,907	971	\$174,786	17.580	2.890	\$520.18
Alcorn.....	2,179	21,566	6,978	1,256,040	9.897	3.202	576.43
Amite.....	1,677	15,867	5,864	1,055,520	9.462	3.497	629.41
Attala.....	2,520	23,715	8,211	1,477,980	9.411	3.258	586.50
Benton.....	1,005	14,424	6,113	1,100,340	14.348	6.083	1,094.87
Bolivar.....	2,185	162,546	123,603	22,248,540	74.392	56.599	10,182.40
Calhoun.....	1,843	20,262	8,543	1,537,740	10.964	4.635	736.70
Carroll.....	1,558	23,217	8,873	1,777,140	14.964	6.337	1,140.65
Chickasaw.....	1,642	22,131	9,423	1,696,140	15.412	5.739	1,032.97
Choctaw.....	1,436	7,655	2,768	498,240	5.331	1.928	346.96
Claiborne.....	622	8,760	2,887	519,660	14.084	4.641	835.47
Clarke.....	1,748	7,928	3,610	649,800	4.535	2.065	371.739
Clay.....	1,193	15,018	5,010	901,800	12.588	4.20	755.91
Coahoma.....	928	109,076	93,660	16,858,800	117.539	100.926	18,166.81
Copiah.....	1,888	13,506	4,185	753,300	7.154	2.217	398.99
Covington.....	2,116	16,180	5,839	1,051,020	7.647	2.759	496.70
De Soto.....	1,553	47,001	25,593	4,606,740	30.265	16.480	2,968.349
Forrest.....	600	2,381	595	107,100	3.968	.992	178.50
Grenada.....	868	16,372	9,906	1,783,080	18.862	11.412	2,054.24
Hinds.....	2,157	41,231	17,888	3,219,840	19.115	8.293	1,492.74
Holmes.....	2,100	51,762	28,765	5,177,700	24.649	13.698	2,465.57
Humphreys.....	1,232	63,686	45,256	8,146,080	51.693	36.734	6,612.08
Issaquena.....	485	19,145	9,519	1,713,420	39.474	19.627	3,532.82
Ittawamba.....	2,391	20,426	6,650	1,197,000	8.543	2.781	500.63
Jasper.....	2,185	12,576	5,529	995,220	5.756	2.530	455.48
Jefferson.....	784	9,572	2,688	483,840	12.209	3.429	617.14
Jefferson Davis.....	2,060	22,876	9,987	1,797,660	11.105	4.848	872.65
Jones.....	2,756	16,734	7,309	1,315,620	5.905	2.652	477.37
Kemper.....	1,766	19,567	5,682	1,022,760	11.080	3.217	579.14
Lafayette.....	1,812	23,366	9,908	1,783,440	12.895	5.468	984.24
Lamar.....	1,139	5,525	1,793	322,740	4.851	1.574	283.35
Lauderdale.....	1,913	10,553	3,706	667,080	5.516	1.937	348.71
Lawrence.....	1,552	13,604	4,208	757,440	8.823	2.711	488.04
Leake.....	2,958	26,611	11,645	2,096,100	8.996	3.937	708.62
Lee.....	2,458	40,389	13,987	2,517,660	16.432	5.690	1,024.27
Leflore.....	1,027	97,701	85,854	15,453,720	95.132	83.597	15,047.44
Lincoln.....	2,124	13,866	3,611	649,980	6.528	1.700	306.02
Lowndes.....	1,815	24,753	9,781	1,760,580	13.638	5.389	970.02
Madison.....	2,032	45,849	20,793	3,742,740	22.563	10.233	1,841.90
Marion.....	2,247	16,725	5,933	1,067,940	7.434	2.640	479.28
Marshall.....	1,816	40,027	16,972	3,054,960	22.041	9.346	1,682.25
Monroe.....	2,847	42,384	16,853	3,033,540	14.887	5.920	1,065.52
Montgomery.....	1,209	12,192	4,113	740,340	10.084	3.402	612.36
Neshoba.....	3,128	26,652	11,543	2,077,740	8.520	3.690	664.24
Newton.....	2,589	17,511	7,823	1,408,140	6.764	3.022	543.89
Noxubee.....	1,443	29,807	11,344	2,041,920	20.656	7.861	1,415.05
Oktibbeha.....	1,312	9,898	2,079	374,220	7.544	1.585	285.23
Panola.....	2,266	52,759	26,087	4,695,660	23.283	11.512	2,072.22
Pike.....	1,863	12,800	2,888	519,840	6.871	1.550	279.03
Pontotoc.....	2,720	29,756	10,395	1,871,100	10.940	3.822	687.96
Prentiss.....	2,151	24,546	10,057	1,810,260	11.411	4.675	841.59
Quitman.....	1,189	72,573	58,628	10,553,040	62.037	49.309	8,875.56
Rankin.....	1,924	16,771	5,958	1,072,440	8.717	3.097	557.40
Scott.....	2,129	17,610	7,602	1,368,360	8.271	3.571	642.72
Sharkey.....	653	39,364	24,624	4,432,320	60.282	37.709	6,787.63
Simpson.....	2,358	19,402	8,846	1,592,280	8.228	3.751	637.10
Smith.....	2,270	16,441	8,706	1,566,000	7.243	3.835	689.87
Sunflower.....	1,698	156,030	123,808	22,285,440	91.890	72.914	13,124.52
Tallahatchie.....	1,491	71,832	49,397	8,891,460	48.171	33.130	5,963.42
Tate.....	1,445	32,753	17,676	3,181,080	22.667	12.233	2,201.86
Tippah.....	2,129	25,750	8,173	1,471,140	11.155	3.839	691.00
Tishomingo.....	2,198	16,140	3,761	676,980	7.343	1.711	308.00
Tunica.....	2,667	66,682	52,072	9,372,960	99.973	78.069	10,052.41
Union.....	2,171	26,481	8,717	1,569,060	12.198	4.015	722.74
Walthall.....	2,071	21,452	7,038	1,266,840	10.358	3.998	611.70
Warren.....	723	9,635	5,172	930,960	13.326	7.154	1,287.63
Washington.....	1,651	114,864	86,977	15,655,860	69.571	52.681	9,482.65
Wayne.....	1,557	9,181	3,858	694,440	5.897	2.478	446.01
Webster.....	1,567	12,806	6,092	1,096,560	8.172	3.888	699.78
Winona.....	2,199	19,503	8,576	1,543,680	8.869	3.900	701.99
Yalobusha.....	1,279	16,284	5,780	1,040,400	12.732	4.519	813.45
Yazoo.....	1,551	59,641	36,796	6,623,280	38.453	23.724	4,270.33
Total.....	125,154	2,647,150	1,272,535	214,308,344	21.518	12.862	1,344.71
Missouri:							
Butler.....	3,329	25,315	10,113	\$1,820,340	7.604	3.037	\$546.81
Dunklin.....	3,734	93,652	63,315	11,396,700	25.081	16.956	3,052.14
Mississippi.....	1,262	35,490	19,074	3,433,320	28.122	15.114	2,720.54
New Madrid.....	2,528	122,947	66,173	11,911,140	48.634	26.176	4,711.69
Pemiscot.....	2,703	127,575	68,184	12,273,120	47.198	25.225	4,540.55
Scott.....	874	22,186	11,344	2,041,920	25.384	12.979	2,336.29
Stoddard.....	2,726	55,292	26,567	4,782,060	20.283	9.746	1,754.24
Total.....	17,156	482,457	264,806	47,658,600	34.615	15.605	2,808.89
New Mexico:							
Chaves.....	744	38,560	42,851	7,713,180	51.827	57.595	10,367.18
Dona Ana.....	1,828	53,117	76,343	13,741,740	29.057	41.763	7,517.36
Eddy.....	554	28,803	35,868	6,456,420	51.990	64.743	11,653.86
Lea.....	459	18,487	10,859	1,954,620	40.276	23.657	4,258.43
Total.....	3,585	138,967	165,921	29,865,780	43.288	46.940	33,796.83
North Carolina:							
Anson.....	2,273	24,155	9,026	1,624,680	10.627	3.971	714.77
Bertie.....	1,664	8,493	1,602	288,360	5.104	.638	173.29
Bladen.....	2,371	8,137	1,113	200,340	3.432	.469	84.50
Cabarrus.....	1,600	9,067	2,553	459,540	5.667	1.596	287.21
Catawba.....	2,415	10,428	1,696	305,280	4.318	.702	126.41
Chowan.....	673	3,122	568	102,240	4.639	.844	151.92
Cleveland.....	4,096	55,251	18,560	3,340,800	13.488	4.331	815.63
Cumberland.....	2,543	19,225	4,614	830,520	7.560	1.814	326.59
Duplin.....	1,604	7,730	1,232	221,760	4.819	.768	138.25
Edgecombe.....	1,518	17,936	3,319	597,420	11.816	2.186	393.56
Franklin.....	2,870	16,203	2,786	501,480	5.646	.971	174.73
Gaston.....	1,620	9,992	1,517	273,060	6.168	.936	168.56
Gates.....	1,123	4,280	799	143,820	3.811	.711	128.07
Greene.....	853	5,939	1,050	189,000	6.962	1.230	221.57
Halifax.....	3,212	31,390	7,058	1,270,440	9.773	2.197	395.53
Harnett.....	3,487	21,963	4,728	851,040	6.299	1.356	244.06
Hertford.....	1,248	5,641	1,000	4,520	4.520	1.555	73.10
Hoke.....	1,129	18,039	7,249	1,304,820	15.978	6.421	1,555.73
Iredell.....	3,753	20,461	7,237	1,302,660	5.452	1.928	347.10
Johnston.....	5,626	33,771	8,233	1,481,940	6.003	1.463	263.41
Lee.....	991	3,400	475	85,500	3.431	.479	86.28
Lenoir.....	815	4,391	614	110,520	5.388	.753	135.61
Lincoln.....	2,099	16,062	4,240	763,200	7.652	2.020	363.60
Martin.....	958	4,295	721	129,780	4.483	.753	135.47
Mecklenburg.....	2,115	16,567	4,876	877,680	7.833	2.305	414.98
Nash.....	2,781	19,031	4,390	790,200	6.843	1.579	284.14
Northampton.....	2,366	23,421	6,181	1,112,580	9.899	2.612	470.24
Perquimans.....	833	4,204	304	54,720	5		

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Oklahoma—Con.							
Muskogee	2,925	47,433	2,541	\$457,380	16.216	0.869	\$156.37
Okfuskee	2,540	28,992	594	106,920	11.414	.234	42.43
Okmulgee	2,424	32,889	474	85,320	13.568	.196	35.20
Osage	736	11,781	732	131,760	16.007	.995	179.02
Pawnee	1,303	11,840	548	98,640	9.087	.421	75.70
Payne	1,220	8,188	418	75,240	6.711	.343	61.67
Pittsburg	1,849	19,291	488	87,840	10.433	.264	47.51
Pottawatomie	1,286	8,098			6.297		
Roger Mills	1,311	20,889	6,195	1,115,100	15.934	4.725	850.57
Stephens	1,779	20,118	600	108,000	11.309	.337	60.71
Tillman	1,568	63,068	33,886	6,099,480	40.222	21.611	3,889.97
Tulsa	635	8,035	(2)		12.654		
Wagoner	2,112	29,878	1,097	197,460	14.147	.519	93.49
Washita	2,711	86,283	40,694	7,324,920	31.827	15.011	2,701.93
Total	72,953	1,166,943	283,380	142,906,000	16.137	3.688	590.62
South Carolina:							
Abbeville	1,608	10,466	4,869	876,420	6.509	3.028	545.04
Aiken	2,379	36,233	13,218	2,379,240	15.230	8.592	1,000.10
Alendale	674	14,355	5,993	1,078,740	21.313	5.566	1,600.50
Anderson	4,216	54,968	16,763	3,017,340	13.038	3.976	715.69
Bamberg	1,108	17,813	6,712	1,208,160	15.806	6.058	1,090.40
Barnwell	1,338	27,040	9,938	1,788,840	20.209	7.428	1,336.95
Calhoun	1,069	21,778	10,668	1,920,240	20.272	9.979	1,796.30
Charleston	2,235	24,387	4,462	803,160	10.911	1.996	349.36
Chester	1,490	18,322	6,311	1,135,980	12.297	4.236	762.40
Chesterfield	2,825	44,170	15,555	2,799,900	15.635	5.506	991.12
Clarendon	2,766	38,816	20,975	3,775,500	14.033	7.583	1,364.97
Colleton	2,399	13,811	3,231	581,580	5.757	1.347	242.43
Darlington	2,166	35,754	18,282	3,290,760	16.507	8.440	1,519.28
Dillon	1,376	27,617	10,957	1,972,260	20.070	7.963	1,433.33
Dorchester	1,577	13,132	6,070	1,092,600	8.327	3.849	692.83
Edgefield	1,380	15,454	7,246	1,304,280	11.199	5.251	945.13
Fairfield	1,065	10,452	3,153	567,540	9.814	2.961	532.00
Florence	3,681	36,764	12,833	2,309,940	9.988	3.486	355.87
Greenville	4,297	36,377	7,151	1,287,180	8.466	1.664	299.55
Greenwood	1,100	10,730	2,675	481,500	9.730	2.432	437.73
Hampton	1,154	10,349	4,331	779,580	8.968	3.753	675.55
Kershaw	1,923	25,892	7,988	1,437,840	13.464	4.154	747.71
Lancaster	1,790	16,433	3,475	625,500	9.180	1.941	349.44
Laurens	2,281	32,648	13,068	2,352,240	14.313	5.729	1,031.23
Lee	1,537	40,593	22,849	4,112,820	26.411	14.866	2,675.88
Lexington	2,098	16,992	5,819	1,047,420	7.956	2.774	499.25
McCormick	738	7,845	2,039	367,020	10.630	2.763	497.32
Marion	1,488	13,317	5,366	965,880	8.950	3.606	649.11
Marlboro	1,188	50,074	26,892	4,840,500	42.150	22.636	4,074.55
Newberry	1,751	15,480	6,781	1,220,580	8.841	3.873	697.08
Oconee	2,492	17,329	5,185	933,300	6.954	2.871	374.52
Orangeburg	4,718	81,325	38,078	6,854,040	17.237	8.071	1,452.74
Pickens	2,351	15,195	3,357	604,260	6.463	1.428	257.02
Richland	1,562	12,002	3,548	638,640	7.684	2.271	408.86
Saluda	1,630	14,568	5,753	1,035,540	8.937	3.529	635.30
Spartanburg	5,353	50,006	11,847	2,132,460	9.342	2.213	398.37
Sumter	2,820	47,638	25,473	4,588,140	16.893	9.031	1,625.94
Union	976	12,893	3,618	651,240	13.210	3.707	637.25
Williamsburg	3,556	33,989	15,670	2,820,600	9.558	4.407	793.19
York	2,185	28,639	8,549	1,538,820	13.107	3.913	704.27
Total	84,340	1,051,056	406,745	73,215,000	13.338	5.209	929.91
Tennessee:							
Benton	1,372	6,058	1,757	316,260	4.415	1.281	230.51
Carroll	3,969	24,957	15,966	2,873,880	6.288	4.025	724.08
Chester	1,507	14,007	5,264	947,520	9.296	3.493	628.75
Crockett	2,228	32,139	25,139	4,825,020	4.556	11.283	2,030.98
Decatur	1,180	7,024	1,468	262,440	5.953	1.236	222.41
Dyer	2,479	42,488	26,698	4,805,640	17.139	10.770	1,938.54
Fayette	2,030	53,425	25,143	4,535,740	26.318	12.386	2,229.43
Franklin	1,764	8,639	5,581	1,004,580	4.897	3.164	569.49
Gibson	5,582	49,989	35,408	6,373,440	8.955	6.343	1,141.78
Giles	2,414	13,907	4,788	851,840	5.761	1.983	357.02
Hardeman	2,145	26,908	10,848	1,952,640	12.545	5.057	910.32
Hardin	1,977	14,692	3,486	627,480	7.431	1.765	317.39
Haywood	2,527	49,810	26,563	6,581,340	19.711	14.469	2,604.41
Henderson	2,600	24,240	9,135	1,644,300	9.232	3.513	632.42
Henry	2,307	9,181	4,150	747,000	3.980	1.799	323.80
Lake	567	27,063	21,674	3,901,320	47.730	38.226	6,880.63
Lauderdale	2,251	39,029	31,208	5,617,440	7.339	13.854	2,495.53
Lawrence	3,628	28,637	10,177	1,831,860	7.892	2.863	504.92
Lincoln	2,032	16,940	8,034	1,446,120	8.337	3.954	718.67
McNairy	2,972	25,976	6,902	1,242,360	8.740	2.322	418.02
Madison	3,245	38,869	24,234	4,362,120	11.978	7.468	1,344.26
Obion	2,006	15,071	7,883	1,418,940	7.513	3.930	707.35
Rutherford	1,939	9,283	4,602	828,360	4.788	2.373	427.21
Shelby	3,977	65,052	28,887	5,199,660	16.357	7.264	1,307.43
Tipton	2,760	52,980	38,969	7,014,420	19.196	14.119	2,541.46
Weakley	3,156	14,262	6,976	1,255,680	4.519	2.210	388.37
Total	64,614	710,626	400,930	72,210,357	9.539	6.436	1,956.43
Texas:							
Anderson	2,574	17,455	2,030	\$365,400	6.781	0.789	\$141.96
Angelina	677	4,831	1,309	235,620	7.136	1.934	348.04
Austin	1,694	23,509	6,699	1,205,820	13.878	3.955	711.82
Bailey	1,370	90,576	6,355	1,143,900	66.114	4.639	834.96
Bastrop	1,086	17,338	4,381	788,580	6.011	4.034	726.13
Baylor	479	15,370	4,878	878,040	32.088	10.184	1,833.07
Bee	639	12,713	2,485	447,300	19.895	3.889	700.00
Bell	3,094	89,073	34,424	6,196,320	28.789	11.126	2,062.69
Bexar	530	6,211	1,070	192,600	11.719	2.019	363.40
Bosque	1,057	17,740	3,664	659,520	16.783	3.466	623.95
Bowie	1,716	30,483	3,153	567,540	17.764	1.837	328.82
Brazoria	533	11,360	6,274	1,129,320	21.313	11.771	2,118.80
Brazos	527	25,729	10,603	1,908,540	48.822	20.120	3,621.52
Briscoe	354	18,234	3,785	681,300	51.508	.692	180.00
Brown	798	1,290	931	167,580	1.616	1.167	210.00
Burleson	1,290	36,481	17,611	3,169,980	28.280	13.652	2,457.35
Burnet	663	9,103	1,443	259,740	13.730	2.176	391.77
Caldwell	853	29,301	9,611	1,729,980	34.351	11.267	2,028.11
Calhoun	350	17,805	9,309	1,675,620	50.871	26.597	4,787.49
Cameron	6,225	161,061	137,557	24,760,260	25.873	22.098	3,977.55
Camp	1,094	6,900	433	76,646	6.307	.396	70.06
Cass	2,958	22,965	2,436	438,480	7.764	.824	148.24
Cherokee	2,899	17,818	2,731	491,580	6.146	.942	169.57
Childress	890	52,630	16,398	2,951,640	59.135	18.425	3,316.45
Clay	646	83,118	1,672	300,960	128.666	2.588	465.88
Cochran	405	7,710	12,976	2,334,960	19.037	32.040	5,765.33
Coleman	1,408	29,376	7,022	1,263,960	20.864	4.987	897.70
Collin	4,200	124,380	23,308	4,195,440	29.614	5.550	998.91
Collingsworth	1,271	75,156	19,089	3,436,020	59.131	15.019	2,703.40
Colorado	1,047	13,447	3,704	666,720	12.843	3.538	636.79
Cooke	1,377	15,376	883	158,940	11.166	.641	115.42
Coryell	1,363	26,401	6,352	1,143,360	19.370	4.660	838.86
Cottle	664	65,711	24,213	4,358,340	83.902	36.465	6,563.77
Crosby	1,162	101,780	46,922	8,445,960	87.590	40.441	7,268.47
Dallas	1,950	55,127	13,250	2,385,000	28.270	6.795	1,223.08
Dawson	1,770	234,991	93,010	16,741,800	132.763	62.548	9,458.64
Delta	1,401	54,520	12,535	9,813,600	38.915	8.947	7,004.71
De Witt	2,056	38,066	5,507	991,260	18.500	2.679	482.13
Dickens	1,515	23,091	6,494	1,158,120	15.578	4.247	764.44
Donley	805	31,207	19,610	3,529,800	63.083	23.125	4,162.50
Duval	942	18,201	1,456	262,080	19.322	1.546	278.22
Ellis	3,447	167,683	65,711	11,827,980	48.464	19.063	4,331.38
El Paso	1,589	44,197	67,132	12,083,760	27.814	42.248	7,604.63
Erath	1,098	12,109	1,546	278,280	7.131	.910	163.89
Falls	2,831	97,614	41,840	7,531,200	34.480	14.779	2,660.261
Fannin	4,131	16,726	7,293	1,312,740	28.266	14.779	2,660.261
Fayette	2,928	38,795	10,751	1,935,180	13.250	3.672	600.92
Fisher	1,481	85,480	39,416	7,094,880	67.718	26.614	4,790.60
Floyd	1,045	51,676	23,971	4,314,780	49.451	22.939	4,128.98
Foard	359	16,970	4,109	739,620	47.270	11.446	2,060.22
Fort							

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Texas—Con.								Texas—Con.							
Live Oak.....	802	19,144	4,413	\$794,340	23.870	5.502	\$990.45	Tarrant.....	591	16,470	3,260	\$586,800	27.868	5.516	\$992.89
Lubbock.....	2,605	247,850	154,438	27,798,840	95.144	59.285	10,671.34	Taylor.....	1,353	36,657	10,974	1,975,320	27.093	8.111	1,459.96
Lynn.....	1,632	198,905	88,780	15,980,400	121.878	54.400	9,791.91	Terry.....	1,352	122,866	43,216	7,778,880	90.877	31.964	5,753.61
McCulloch.....	636	16,776	3,029	545,220	26.377	4.763	857.26	Throckmorton.....	255	5,980	2,987	537,660	23.451	11.714	2,081.02
McLennan.....	3,442	121,393	39,640	7,135,200	35.268	11.517	2,072.98	Tom Green.....	837	56,976	26,112	4,700,160	68.072	31.197	5,615.48
Madison.....	679	9,753	2,543	457,740	14.364	3.745	674.14	Travis.....	1,282	49,488	15,691	2,824,380	38.602	12.239	2,203.10
Martin.....	795	99,023	46,317	8,337,060	124.557	58.260	10,486.87	Trinity.....	623	4,785	1,848	332,640	7.681	2.966	533.93
Matagorda.....	762	16,759	7,307	1,315,260	21.993	9.589	1,726.06	Upshur.....	1,577	10,179	5,555	105,913	6.455	2.352	67.16
Midland.....	341	23,758	8,984	1,617,120	69.672	26.346	4,742.29	Van Zandt.....	2,601	39,234	6,066	1,091,880	15.084	2.332	419.80
Maverick.....	186	7,922	4,935	888,300	42.591	26.532	4,775.81	Victoria.....	1,010	25,962	11,348	2,042,640	25.705	11.236	2,022.42
Milam.....	2,245	63,902	21,137	3,804,660	28.464	9.415	1,694.73	Walker.....	848	7,838	2,134	384,120	9.243	2.517	452.97
Mitchell.....	1,022	67,784	38,570	6,942,600	66.325	37.740	6,793.15	Waller.....	516	7,255	2,082	374,760	14.060	4.035	726.28
Morris.....	887	7,242	529	95,220	8.165	.596	107.35	Ward.....	174	11,501	6,672	1,200,960	66.098	38.345	6,902.07
Motley.....	512	38,779	8,662	1,559,160	75.740	6.918	3,045.23	Washington.....	2,410	34,285	9,892	1,780,560	14.226	4.105	1,762.93
Nacogdoches.....	1,682	13,575	1,983	356,940	8.071	1.179	212.21	Wharton.....	2,407	81,361	37,850	6,813,000	33.801	18.925	2,830.49
Navarro.....	3,304	139,335	45,257	8,146,260	42.172	13.698	2,465.58	Wheeler.....	952	33,861	5,005	900,900	35.568	5.257	946.32
Nolan.....	747	41,297	20,106	3,619,080	55.284	26.916	4,844.82	Wichita.....	523	10,261	1,209	219,620	19.620	2.312	416.10
Nueces.....	1,711	99,589	45,449	8,180,820	58.205	26.563	4,781.31	Wilbarger.....	1,232	66,818	18,609	3,349,620	54.235	15.105	2,718.85
Panola.....	1,969	19,182	1,675	301,500	9.742	.851	153.12	Willacy.....	1,227	107,793	79,781	14,360,580	87.851	65.02	11,703.81
Pecos.....	282	17,110	9,703	1,746,540	60.674	34.408	6,193.40	Williamson.....	3,612	141,444	57,257	10,306,260	39.159	15.851	2,850.19
Red River.....	2,006	51,332	5,171	930,780	25.588	2.578	464.00	Wilson.....	797	9,114	1,490	268,200	11.435	1.870	336.51
Reeves.....	251	20,855	33,910	6,103,800	83.088	35.100	24,317.93	Wood.....	1,904	10,474	418	75,240	5.501	.220	395.17
Refugio.....	304	11,936	5,798	1,043,640	39.263	19.072	472.50	Young.....	584	10,896	2,615	470,700	18.658	4.478	805.99
Robertson.....	1,079	39,373	16,911	3,043,980	36.490	15.673	2,820.80	Total.....	217,922	7,549,039	3,222,907	512,934,180	39.097	42.362	2,755.31
Rockwall.....	717	32,676	7,200	1,296,000	45.573	10.042	1,807.53	Virginia:							
Runnels.....	1,770	89,754	28,706	5,167,080	50.708	16.218	2,919.25	Brunswick.....	1,497	4,437	614	110,520	2.963	.410	73.85
Rusk.....	2,967	26,403	3,013	542,340	8.899	1.016	182.79	Greensville.....	1,138	5,865	613	110,340	5.153	.538	96.96
San Augustine.....	743	8,271	1,889	340,020	11.132	2.542	457.63	Mecklenburg.....	1,171	3,970	720	129,600	3.390	.614	110.67
San Patricio.....	1,137	71,557	33,777	6,079,860	62.935	29.710	5,347.28	Nansemond.....	1,285	3,740	611	109,980	2.910	.475	85.59
Scurry.....	1,234	85,307	35,040	6,307,200	69.130	28.395	5,111.18	Southampton.....	1,521	7,456	1,522	273,960	4.902	1.000	180.12
Shelby.....	2,482	18,041	2,040	367,200	7.269	.822	147.95	Total.....	6,612	25,468	4,080	734,403	3.863	.608	109.44
Smith.....	2,695	17,600	1,861	334,980	6.531	.691	124.30								
Starr.....	1,298	25,910	3,763	677,340	20.434	2.968	534.18								
Stonewall.....	483	24,077	8,831	1,589,580	49.849	18.284	3,291.06								

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of January 3 requesting information on cotton prices during 1950.

The following figures show monthly average prices for Middling $\frac{15}{16}$ -inch cotton in the 10 designated spot markets and mid-month average prices received by farmers for cotton, 1950 calendar year:

[Cents per pound]

Month	10-market Middling $\frac{15}{16}$ -inch	Midmonth farm price
1950—January.....	31.03	26.47
February.....	31.98	27.50
March.....	31.93	28.05
April.....	32.47	28.74
May.....	32.90	29.24
June.....	33.81	29.91
July.....	37.12	33.05
August.....	38.06	36.95
September.....	40.68	39.98
October.....	39.81	38.90
November.....	42.24	41.13
December.....	42.59	40.36

The average spot price for Middling $\frac{15}{16}$ -inch was 36.22 cents in the 1950 calendar year. The average for the August–December 1950 period was 40.68 cents. These are simple averages of the monthly average prices shown above.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK K. WOOLLEY,
Deputy Administrator.

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties

[This report includes data for both old and new cotton farms]

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Alabama:		
Autauga.....	1,183	15,607.6
Baldwin.....	704	2,346.6
Barbour.....	1,702	18,812.5
Bibb.....	774	6,715.5
Blount.....	4,017	32,396.6
Bullock.....	815	16,138.9
Butler.....	1,856	14,847.9
Calhoun.....	1,803	14,637.2
Chambers.....	1,416	19,543.2
Cherokee.....	2,142	35,917.2
Chilton.....	2,622	16,223.7
Choctaw.....	1,638	8,325.3
Clarke.....	1,694	7,434.4
Clay.....	1,744	9,847.4
Cleburne.....	1,192	8,540.2
Coffee.....	2,088	24,717.3
Colbert.....	1,990	36,135.3
Conecuh.....	2,387	15,755.1
Coosa.....	988	4,073.1
Covington.....	2,691	22,232.9
Crenshaw.....	1,644	17,901.9
Cullman.....	6,829	61,493.1
Dale.....	1,341	10,562.8
Dallas.....	1,634	40,331.4
De Kalb.....	6,034	55,394.6
Elmore.....	2,240	26,817.6
Escambia.....	1,588	13,329.5
Etowah.....	3,044	25,265.8
Fayette.....	2,392	16,878.5
Franklin.....	2,648	25,530.9
Geneva.....	2,116	25,152.9
Greene.....	1,342	21,453.2
Hale.....	1,814	24,169.5
Henry.....	1,322	19,406.1
Houston.....	2,764	33,325.5
Jackson.....	4,254	43,761.1
Jefferson.....	1,380	6,547.3
Lamar.....	2,424	20,927.8
Lauderdale.....	3,971	48,569.2

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Alabama—Continued		
Lawrence.....	3,183	61,337.4
Lee.....	1,183	14,434.8
Limestone.....	3,491	68,655.5
Lowndes.....	823	17,494.8
Macon.....	1,616	25,558.1
Madison.....	3,500	87,430.3
Marengo.....	1,951	28,329.6
Marion.....	3,381	25,221.8
Marshall.....	5,015	52,687.0
Mobile.....	6,121	3,226.6
Monroe.....	2,176	25,095.5
Montgomery.....	1,171	19,248.9
Morgan.....	4,125	48,774.2
Perry.....	1,215	18,777.0
Pickens.....	2,295	26,682.4
Pike.....	1,601	26,268.4
Randolph.....	2,714	20,442.6
Russell.....	831	16,296.7
St. Clair.....	1,878	12,778.6
Shelby.....	971	9,305.3
Sumter.....	1,238	22,877.9
Talladega.....	2,282	24,167.7
Tallapoosa.....	1,545	14,056.8
Tuscaloosa.....	3,264	30,545.5
Walker.....	3,259	16,086.2
Washington.....	693	2,627.2
Wilcox.....	1,453	18,630.9
Winston.....	2,282	15,709.5
State total.....	145,924	1,619,813.8
Arizona:		
Cochise.....	235	5,679.2
Graham.....	499	15,064.0
Greenlee.....	139	1,611.2
Maricopa.....	1,944	91,395.0
Pima.....	66	11,159.0
Pinal.....	1,037	117,561.6
Santa Cruz.....	7	954.0
Yuma.....	186	3,561.0
State total.....	4,113	247,585.0

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Arkansas:		
Arkansas	1,430	13,027.7
Ashley	1,057	29,007.1
Baxter	155	464.3
Boone	20	116.4
Bradley	1,206	10,107.2
Calhoun	839	7,779.8
Chicot	1,729	45,230.0
Clark	1,148	12,818.2
Clay	3,544	48,408.2
Cleburne	1,749	10,016.7
Cleveland	1,184	9,460.2
Columbia	2,732	24,716.9
Conway	1,951	21,453.1
Craighead	4,032	85,578.4
Crawford	208	2,282.9
Crittenden	1,728	110,763.7
Cross	1,536	44,561.1
Dallas	816	5,585.1
Desha	1,582	58,073.6
Drew	1,474	19,985.9
Faulkner	2,907	33,253.6
Franklin	505	2,792.0
Fulton	1,041	4,234.0
Garland	250	707.7
Grant	688	3,158.6
Greene	3,521	46,690.6
Hempstead	2,510	28,667.7
Hot Spring	632	3,435.4
Howard	951	8,110.9
Independence	1,584	16,695.0
Izard	1,408	9,432.9
Jackson	1,672	65,419.1
Jefferson	1,904	91,457.4
Johnson	242	3,195.6
Lafayette	1,122	22,581.8
Lawrence	2,121	34,452.9
Lee	2,348	69,975.1
Lincoln	1,468	47,313.0
Little River	1,752	13,299.9
Logan	1,259	8,789.7
Lonoke	2,830	70,131.1
Marion	101	346.2
Miller	1,122	24,186.5
Mississippi	3,399	228,712.9
Monroe	1,711	40,669.5
Montgomery	361	1,162.1
Nevada	1,620	14,169.5
Newton	49	138.5
Ouachita	911	7,287.1
Perry	505	4,858.0
Phillips	2,605	90,200.7
Pike	492	1,947.2
Poinsett	2,072	96,375.9
Polk	341	1,136.5
Pope	1,266	11,317.7
Prairie	1,263	15,035.4
Pulaski	1,194	32,503.5
Randolph	1,636	20,008.1
St. Francis	1,911	86,342.1
Saline	368	1,004.2
Scott	439	1,547.6
Searcy	308	1,188.0
Sebastian	605	2,707.2
Sevier	525	3,159.7
Sharp	1,142	9,631.1
Stone	449	1,260.4
Union	1,219	8,002.8
Van Buren	1,238	6,609.4
White	4,429	45,658.4
Woodruff	1,371	48,433.9
Yell	1,319	17,052.4
State total	97,806	1,965,883.0
California:		
Fresno	3,660	178,170.1
Imperial	54	1,027.7
Kern	2,100	165,401.7
Kings	1,080	91,191.1
Madera	1,260	52,749.3
Merced	372	22,878.9
Riverside	186	5,273.0
San Benito	1	46.0
San Bernardino	1	31.0
Stanislaus	4	62.6
Tulare	3,972	129,082.0
State total	12,690	645,863.4
Florida:		
Alachua	3	16.0
Bay	13	51.6
Calhoun	58	152.6
Columbia	151	396.2
Duval	2	7.0
Escambia	342	1,913.9
Gadsden	13	15.7
Hamilton	329	1,624.5
Holmes	1,212	6,369.7
Jackson	2,255	9,509.3
Jefferson	458	2,618.0
Lafayette	100	306.7

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Florida—Continued		
Leon	341	1,955.0
Liberty	1	5.0
Madison	910	4,164.3
Okaloosa	413	2,461.9
Santa Rosa	802	5,498.0
Suwannee	389	959.3
Taylor	2	5.8
Walton	639	3,136.4
Washington	479	1,464.8
State total	8,912	42,631.7
Georgia:		
Appling	1,050	6,497.7
Atkinson	290	1,166.0
Bacon	672	3,297.1
Baker	351	3,556.4
Baldwin	414	4,494.9
Banks	949	7,449.5
Barrow	1,045	12,412.6
Bartow	1,248	24,789.1
Ben Hill	549	6,075.8
Berrien	711	3,341.0
Bibb	187	1,444.4
Bleckley	583	10,301.4
Brantley	32	50.0
Brooks	1,272	8,284.3
Bryan	99	433.1
Bulloch	1,770	22,007.6
Burke	1,414	49,753.4
Butts	483	8,982.9
Calhoun	353	5,526.1
Camden	4	1.7
Candler	595	8,543.2
Carroll	2,605	25,759.3
Catoosa	574	3,546.7
Charlton	4	11.1
Chatham	16	54.1
Chattahoochee	46	260.2
Chattooga	920	10,132.6
Cherokee	1,289	6,911.3
Clarke	506	4,510.1
Clay	305	4,489.7
Clayton	372	3,677.4
Cline	73	196.1
Cobb	1,439	9,194.5
Coffee	1,128	8,422.4
Colquitt	1,773	19,322.1
Columbia	573	5,079.3
Cook	626	3,395.6
Coweta	1,139	14,507.8
Crawford	317	3,068.4
Crisp	628	11,990.2
Dade	320	1,388.2
Dawson	271	1,374.3
Decatur	691	3,321.9
DeKalb	378	2,311.5
Dodge	1,340	19,916.9
Dooly	1,063	23,846.0
Dougherty	237	2,322.4
Douglas	705	4,834.6
Early	1,158	15,753.2
Echols	54	175.2
Effingham	401	2,617.1
Elbert	1,463	17,167.0
Emanuel	1,415	23,580.0
Evans	370	4,315.0
Fayette	802	10,725.7
Floyd	1,403	19,294.0
Forsyth	1,466	10,971.2
Franklin	1,642	16,791.0
Fulton	1,001	8,383.3
Gilmer	50	188.5
Gloucester	361	7,612.8
Gordon	1,599	18,442.6
Grady	723	3,274.4
Greene	776	8,174.6
Gwinnett	2,007	17,788.6
Habersham	411	2,066.4
Hall	1,555	11,256.5
Hancock	961	13,339.8
Haralson	1,231	8,376.0
Harris	491	4,113.4
Hart	1,643	22,281.6
Heard	727	8,040.0
Henry	1,245	20,303.4
Houston	565	8,940.6
Irwin	855	11,167.8
Jackson	1,506	21,619.7
Jasper	423	8,255.3
Jeff Davis	557	2,672.1
Jefferson	1,149	28,713.6
Jenkins	694	16,621.9
Johnson	848	21,421.4
Jones	258	1,498.5
Lamar	513	5,539.5
Lanier	149	618.2
Laurens	2,170	39,054.2
Lee	361	3,370.3
Liberty	65	111.1
Lincoln	505	6,104.2
Long	177	602.5

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Georgia—Continued		
Lowndes	791	3,594.2
Lumpkin	169	717.1
McDuffie	564	10,930.5
McIntosh	1	2.5
Macon	693	17,826.0
Madison	1,517	17,342.6
Marion	423	4,908.3
Meriwether	1,157	18,520.1
Miller	683	5,893.4
Mitchell	1,090	13,236.5
Monroe	440	4,165.0
Montgomery	518	6,123.7
Morgan	795	21,899.3
Murray	934	7,902.4
Muscogee	62	410.8
Newton	808	13,706.5
Oconee	728	11,707.7
Oglethorpe	1,193	13,896.6
Paulding	1,081	9,945.9
Peach	179	3,384.5
Pickens	521	3,151.0
Pierce	649	3,028.2
Pike	643	11,286.7
Polk	1,323	13,588.8
Pulaski	544	11,185.5
Putnam	341	3,782.6
Quitman	159	1,985.3
Randolph	569	8,980.1
Richmond	347	4,722.5
Rockdale	565	7,179.6
Schley	299	5,771.7
Screven	1,308	24,850.6
Seminole	580	4,904.4
Spalding	508	6,951.3
Stephens	429	2,829.3
Stewart	408	4,617.3
Sumter	784	14,381.6
Talbot	429	2,979.6
Taliaferro	387	4,455.7
Tattnall	980	7,593.4
Taylor	568	10,241.9
Telfair	859	7,095.7
Terrell	555	13,622.8
Thomas	824	5,098.0
Tift	858	7,549.4
Toombs	973	10,629.4
Treutlen	422	5,717.9
Troup	645	5,593.9
Turner	670	7,320.9
Twiggs	530	5,381.5
Upson	433	3,118.3
Walker	1,350	8,316.9
Walton	1,387	30,324.7
Ware	323	1,000.8
Warren	598	17,040.9
Washington	1,226	23,308.0
Wayne	521	3,812.4
Webster	278	2,339.4
Wheeler	549	5,711.1
White	465	2,627.3
Whitfield	1,379	7,231.3
Wilcox	951	15,366.0
Wilkes	1,016	10,960.1
Wilkinson	595	4,938.5
Worth	1,368	16,647.3
State total	114,092	1,399,537.3
Illinois:		
Alexander	327	2,579.4
Johnson	1	8.4
Pulaski	389	2,364.8
State total	717	4,952.6
Kansas:		
Chautauqua	1	6.0
Cowley	7	11.0
Montgomery	13	123.0
State total	21	140.0
Kentucky:		
Ballard	3	25.2
Calloway	468	756.3
Carlisle	111	361.6
Fulton	502	9,864.7
Graves	283	429.8
Hickman	538	2,280.2
McCracken	6	14.0
Marshall	156	214.4
State total	2,067	13,946.2
Louisiana:		
Acadia	2,151	22,018.3
Allen	682	2,738.6
Ascension	248	864.6
Assumption	5	29.0
Avoynes	3,926	31,193.2
Beauregard	310	979.8
Bienville	1,751	15,985.5

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Louisiana—Continued		
Bossier	1,421	34,024.9
Caddo	1,438	55,919.6
Calcasieu	217	1,155.5
Caldwell	661	7,498.4
Cameron	376	1,775.7
Catahoula	996	15,267.0
Claiborne	1,889	28,377.9
Concordia	603	12,547.4
De Soto	1,740	22,301.9
East Baton Rouge	500	2,212.5
East Carroll	990	33,452.6
East Feliciana	789	8,283.3
Evangeline	2,138	24,660.5
Franklin	2,341	59,797.6
Grant	379	6,147.2
Iberia	409	2,703.6
Iberville	257	1,199.4
Jackson	571	3,391.5
Jefferson Davis	790	3,969.4
Lafayette	2,549	25,538.1
Lafourche	1	379.0
La Salle	258	1,085.0
Lincoln	1,305	15,581.0
Madison	720	22,874.3
Livingston	182	742.4
Morehouse	1,157	36,278.6
Natchitoches	1,805	40,479.5
Orleans	4	14.6
Ouachita	988	19,831.0
Pointe Coupee	1,090	13,333.7
Rapides	1,588	20,042.1
Red River	921	22,278.8
Richland	2,000	54,259.6
Sabine	1,329	7,767.0
St. Helena	924	3,536.1
St. James	3	7.5
St. Landry	4,055	48,158.1
St. Martin	1,632	12,536.9
St. Mary	8	72.5
St. Tammany	220	834.3
Tangipahoa	828	3,277.1
Tensas	689	25,250.6
Union	1,864	16,869.9
Vermilion	2,284	15,292.7
Vernon	1,122	4,718.6
Washington	1,628	11,421.8
Webster	1,422	15,997.2
West Baton Rouge	193	1,556.7
West Carroll	2,080	30,372.0
West Feliciana	311	3,497.2
Winn	613	3,357.6
State total	63,331	875,736.4

Mississippi		
Adams	336	5,907.1
Alcorn	2,179	21,566.3
Amite	1,677	15,866.8
Attala	2,520	23,714.8
Benton	1,005	14,423.5
Bolivar	2,185	162,545.5
Calhoun	1,843	20,262.4
Carroll	1,558	23,216.9
Chickasaw	1,642	22,131.2
Choctaw	1,436	7,654.8
Claiborne	622	8,759.7
Clarke	1,748	7,927.6
Clay	1,193	15,017.7
Coahoma	928	109,076.1
Copiah	1,888	13,506.3
Covington	2,116	16,179.8
De Soto	1,553	47,001.4
Forrest	600	2,380.5
Franklin	595	4,768.0
George	410	1,672.6
Greene	499	1,612.5
Grenada	868	16,371.9
Hancock	39	74.1
Harrison	37	62.7
Hinds	2,157	41,231.3
Holmes	2,100	51,761.7
Humphreys	1,232	63,685.5
Issaquena	485	19,145.3
Itawamba	2,391	20,425.6
Jackson	13	47.0
Jasper	2,185	12,575.6
Jefferson	784	9,571.9
Jefferson Davis	2,060	22,876.1
Jones	2,756	16,273.9
Kemper	1,766	19,566.9
Lafayette	1,812	23,365.7
Lamar	1,139	5,524.6
Lauderdale	1,913	10,552.8
Lawrence	1,552	13,694.2
Leake	2,958	26,610.7
Lee	2,438	40,388.5
Leflore	1,027	97,700.6
Lincoln	2,124	13,865.7
Lowndes	1,815	24,753.1
Madison	2,032	45,849.2
Marion	2,247	16,725.0
Marshall	1,816	40,027.4

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Mississippi—Continued		
Monroe	2,847	42,384.0
Montgomery	1,209	12,192.3
Neshoba	3,128	26,652.0
Newton	2,589	17,511.0
Noxubee	1,443	29,897.1
Oktibbeha	1,312	9,897.8
Panola	2,265	52,759.1
Pearl River	128	372.3
Perry	729	2,587.9
Pike	1,863	12,799.7
Pontotoc	2,720	29,755.9
Prentiss	2,151	24,546.2
Quitman	1,189	72,572.5
Rankin	1,924	16,770.7
Scott	2,129	17,610.0
Sharkey	635	39,363.9
Simpson	2,358	19,401.7
Smith	2,270	16,440.7
Stone	118	329.9
Sunflower	1,698	156,030.4
Tallahatchie	1,491	71,831.9
Tate	1,445	32,753.3
Tippah	2,129	23,749.6
Tishomingo	2,198	16,139.8
Tunica	667	66,681.9
Union	2,171	26,481.1
Walthall	2,071	21,452.3
Warren	723	9,635.0
Washington	1,651	114,863.7
Wayne	1,557	9,181.1
Webster	1,567	12,805.5
Wilkinson	654	7,801.9
Winston	2,199	19,503.4
Yalobusha	1,279	16,284.2
Yazoo	1,551	59,640.6
State total	128,358	2,306,508.9

Missouri		
Bollinger	34	137.8
Butler	3,329	25,314.9
Cape Girardeau	15	294.7
Carter	6	21.3
Dunklin	3,734	93,652.3
Howell	29	114.7
Mississippi	1,262	35,489.8
New Madrid	2,528	122,047.0
Oregon	124	491.4
Ozark	27	121.5
Pemiscot	2,703	127,574.7
Ripley	836	4,713.3
Scott	874	22,186.0
Stoddard	2,726	55,292.4
Wayne	3	8.6
State total	18,230	488,360.4

Nevada: Nye		
	2	110.0
New Mexico		
Chaves	744	38,559.9
Curry	11	120.9
De Baca	54	240.3
Dona Ana	1,828	53,117.4
Eddy	554	28,803.2
Harding	9	44.0
Hidalgo	100	2,835.2
Lea	459	18,487.0
Luna	227	10,225.6
Otero	41	755.4
Quay	328	6,322.2
Roosevelt	928	15,997.8
Sierra	125	2,081.6
Socorro	107	865.7
Valencia	10	100.0
State total	5,525	178,556.2
North Carolina		
Alamance	142	350.9
Alexander	1,240	3,502.5
Anson	2,273	24,155.0
Beaufort	1,056	3,577.9
Bertie	1,664	8,493.3
Bladen	2,371	8,137.4
Brunswick	283	637.1
Burke	414	1,108.6
Cabarrus	1,600	9,067.4
Caldwell	110	240.1
Camden	434	1,862.1
Carteret	142	354.3
Caswell	3	6.6
Catawba	2,415	10,427.7
Chatham	1,013	2,943.1
Chowan	673	3,121.9
Cleveland	4,096	55,250.7
Columbus	1,492	4,969.7
Craven	544	1,457.8
Cumberland	2,543	19,225.4
Currituck	467	1,307.3
Davidson	820	2,131.6
Davie	1,327	4,624.3

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
North Carolina—Continued		
Duplin	1,604	7,729.6
Durham	108	328.9
Edgecombe	1,518	17,936.2
Forsyth	144	276.5
Franklin	2,870	16,202.6
Gaston	1,620	9,992.2
Gates	1,123	4,279.9
Granville	422	1,115.9
Greene	853	5,938.9
Guilford	158	363.3
Halifax	3,212	31,389.6
Harnett	3,487	21,963.2
Hertford	1,248	5,641.3
Hoke	1,129	18,039.2
Hyde	721	3,000.3
Iredell	3,753	20,460.5
Johnston	5,626	33,771.3
Jones	227	733.3
Lee	991	3,399.6
Lenoir	815	4,391.0
Lincoln	2,099	16,061.6
Martin	958	4,295.1
Mecklenburg	2,115	16,566.7
Montgomery	503	2,539.2
Moore	683	3,151.9
Nash	2,781	19,031.3
New Hanover	12	55.4
Northampton	2,366	23,421.0
Onslow	257	681.4
Orange	201	533.6
Pamlico	457	1,568.2
Pasquotank	455	1,547.3
Pender	293	811.6
Perquimans	853	4,203.6
Pitt	1,790	9,340.6
Polk	803	4,476.0
Randolph	192	389.0
Richmond	1,296	10,578.4
Robeson	4,739	53,704.1
Rowan	2,416	11,653.8
Rutherford	3,283	22,414.2
Sampson	5,044	32,703.4
Scotland	894	24,934.9
Stanly	1,781	7,069.4
Tyrrell	245	635.1
Union	4,577	33,173.2
Vance	1,289	4,817.7
Wake	3,108	14,614.5
Warren	2,761	14,565.0
Washington	469	1,498.8
Wayne	2,961	20,307.4
Wilkes	75	180.8
Wilson	2,082	13,114.1
Yadkin	129	253.6
State total	112,748	748,796.9

Oklahoma		
Adair	33	106.6
Atoka	1,068	6,021.4
Beckham	2,030	69,266.3
Blaine	931	13,039.1
Bryan	2,721	28,858.9
Caddo	3,969	64,905.1
Canadian	980	14,012.0
Carter	828	5,121.8
Cherokee	245	1,177.5
Choctaw	1,731	13,528.7
Cleveland	740	5,999.1
Coal	922	8,430.7
Comanche	1,478	18,845.3
Cotton	1,013	20,630.4
Craig	41	228.1
Creek	2,222	18,521.6
Custer	1,030	19,652.1
Delaware	5	15.0
Dewey	840	8,366.6
Ellis	75	495.3
Garfield	7	71.3
Garvin	1,775	16,356.8
Grady	2,981	27,835.7
Greer	1,445	52,037.4
Harmon	1,068	56,327.3
Haskell	1,590	11,411.9
Hughes	2,227	17,306.2
Jefferson	2,066	69,663.0
Johnston	1,173	31,916.3
Kay	685	5,595.8
Kingfisher	45	558.1
Kiowa	277	2,231.5
Latimer	1,945	56,061.1
LeFlore	479	2,120.3
Lincoln	2,097	15,203.8
Logan	1,986	13,009.9
Love	1,272	9,033.1
McCain	1,158	16,008.2
McClain	1,637	21,528.8
McCurtain	1,710	22,267.4
McIntosh	2,939	34,681.1
Major	170	1,216.5
Marshall	496	7,965.0
Mayes	653	3,755.2

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Oklahoma—Continued		
Murray	357	2,158.4
Muskogee	2,925	47,432.7
Noble	481	3,196.5
Nowata	114	990.6
Oklfuskee	2,540	28,991.6
Oklahoma	359	2,914.6
Oklmulgee	2,424	32,889.0
Osage	736	11,780.7
Pawnee	1,303	11,840.2
Payne	1,220	8,188.1
Pittsburg	1,849	19,291.1
Pontotoc	1,051	5,867.8
Pottawatomie	1,286	8,097.7
Pushmataha	606	3,197.5
Roger Mills	1,311	20,888.6
Rogers	652	3,922.4
Seminole	1,548	8,827.7
Sequoyah	927	6,483.7
Stephens	1,779	20,117.6
Tillman	1,568	63,068.0
Tulsa	635	8,035.4
Wagoner	2,112	29,877.9
Washington	76	353.3
Washita	2,711	86,282.6
Woodward	34	202.4
State total	85,187	1,257,179.4
South Carolina:		
Abbeville	1,608	16,465.9
Aiken	2,379	36,233.0
Allendale	674	14,365.3
Anderson	4,216	54,968.8
Bamberg	1,108	17,512.6
Barnwell	1,338	27,039.7
Beaufort	714	1,631.9
Berkeley	2,006	10,733.5
Calhoun	1,069	21,778.2
Charleston	684	1,274.0
Cherokee	2,235	24,386.6
Chester	1,490	18,321.9
Chesterfield	2,825	44,169.5
Clarendon	2,766	38,816.2
Colleton	2,399	13,811.0
Darlington	2,166	35,754.4
Dillon	1,376	27,617.4
Dorchester	1,577	13,132.3
Edgefield	1,380	15,454.4
Fairfield	1,065	10,451.6
Florence	3,681	32,764.3
Georgetown	828	2,860.5
Greenville	4,297	36,377.4
Greenwood	1,100	10,730.0
Hampton	1,154	10,348.5
Horry	2,437	8,258.8
Jasper	727	3,329.2
Kershaw	1,923	25,891.7
Lancaster	1,790	16,433.0
Laurens	2,281	32,647.5
Lee	1,537	40,592.6
Lexington	2,098	16,692.1
McCormick	738	7,845.4
Marion	1,488	13,316.9
Marlboro	1,188	50,074.1
Newberry	1,751	15,479.5
Oconee	2,492	17,329.4
Orangeburg	4,718	81,325.0
Pickens	2,351	15,195.2
Richland	1,562	12,001.9
Saluda	1,630	14,567.7
Spartanburg	5,353	50,006.3
Sumter	2,820	47,638.3
Union	976	12,893.0
Williamsburg	3,556	33,988.8
York	2,185	28,638.8
State total	91,736	1,081,144.1
Tennessee:		
Bedford	750	2,753.7
Benton	1,372	6,057.9
Bradley	1,131	4,337.4
Cannon	55	82.3
Carroll	3,969	24,956.9
Chester	1,507	14,007.2
Coffee	762	2,532.3
Crockett	2,228	32,139.0
Davidson	11	39.3
Decatur	1,180	7,024.3
De Kalb	97	109.7
Dickson	2	5.4
Dyer	2,479	42,487.7
Fayette	2,030	53,424.8
Franklin	1,764	8,638.5
Gibson	5,582	49,989.0
Giles	2,414	13,906.7
Grundy	130	417.9
Hamilton	613	1,951.4
Hardeman	2,145	26,907.6
Hardin	1,977	14,692.2
Haywood	2,527	49,809.9
Henderson	2,600	24,239.6
Henry	2,307	9,181.4

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Tennessee—Continued		
Hickman	17	53.6
Humphreys	2	5.0
Knox	5	28.2
Lake	567	27,063.0
Lauderdale	2,251	39,029.4
Lawrence	3,628	28,637.3
Lewis	201	654.6
Lincoln	2,032	16,940.4
Loudon	17	33.8
McMinn	1,419	4,485.7
McNairy	2,972	25,976.4
Madison	3,245	38,869.3
Marion	253	1,136.1
Marshall	225	758.3
Maury	169	431.3
Meigs	482	1,669.3
Monroe	724	1,772.1
Montgomery	2	1.0
Moore	55	197.8
Obion	2,006	15,071.3
Perry	79	381.5
Polk	521	3,496.3
Rhea	30	72.9
Roane	12	9.3
Robertson	1	1.0
Rutherford	1,939	9,283.1
Sequatchie	1	4.0
Shelby	3,977	65,051.6
Stewart	4	18.0
Tipton	2,760	52,980.3
Van Buren	23	77.9
Warren	432	1,232.4
Wayne	1,203	6,020.2
Weakley	3,156	14,261.7
White	88	227.2
Williamson	76	212.3
Wilson	43	131.6
State total	74,249	745,967.3
Texas:		
Anderson	2,574	17,455.3
Andrews	56	3,024.1
Angelina	677	4,831.0
Aransas	20	1,145.6
Archer	151	1,718.2
Armstrong	25	924.6
Atascosa	601	8,477.6
Austin	1,694	23,508.9
Bailey	1,370	90,575.8
Bastrop	1,086	17,338.1
Baylor	479	15,373.0
Bee	639	12,712.9
Bell	3,094	89,072.9
Bexar	530	6,211.4
Blanco	85	440.9
Borden	224	19,316.4
Bosque	1,057	17,740.1
Bowie	1,716	30,482.9
Brazoria	533	11,359.9
Brazos	527	25,728.6
Briscoe	354	18,233.8
Brooks	267	3,659.7
Brown	798	7,118.3
Burleson	1,290	36,480.6
Burnet	663	9,103.4
Caldwell	853	29,300.7
Calhoun	350	17,804.8
Callahan	606	8,055.3
Cameron	6,225	161,060.6
Camp	1,094	6,900.6
Cass	2,958	25,964.7
Castro	339	9,105.9
Chambers	23	235.0
Cherokee	2,899	17,818.3
Childress	890	52,629.8
Clay	853	18,772.9
Cochran	646	83,118.1
Coke	405	7,704.7
Coleman	1,408	29,375.6
Collin	4,200	124,380.3
Collingsworth	1,271	75,156.0
Colorado	1,047	13,447.0
Comal	109	604.2
Comanche	842	6,332.7
Concho	425	24,492.9
Cooke	1,377	15,375.6
Coryell	1,363	26,401.2
Cottle	664	55,711.1
Crockett	1	85.0
Crosby	1,162	101,780.2
Culberson	8	246.5
Dallas	1,950	55,127.0
Dawson	1,770	234,990.8
Deaf Smith	81	1,905.9
Delta	1,401	54,520.1
Denton	2,056	38,035.6
De Witt	1,515	23,601.2
Dickens	848	53,494.0
Dimmit	30	626.9
Donley	805	81,206.9
Duval	942	18,200.8
Eastland	389	2,994.4
Ector	8	335.0

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Texas—Continued		
Edwards	2	7.6
Ellis	3,447	167,682.8
El Paso	1,589	44,197.4
Erath	1,698	12,108.6
Falls	2,831	97,613.7
Fannin	4,131	116,725.8
Fayette	2,928	38,794.5
Fisher	1,481	85,480.2
Floyd	1,045	51,675.6
Foard	359	16,969.5
Fort Bend	2,152	71,048.4
Franklin	898	9,108.7
Freestone	1,948	27,371.3
Frio	60	1,085.1
Gaines	668	43,634.7
Galveston	4	23.5
Garza	536	48,599.7
Gillespie	173	773.2
Glasscock	102	7,924.3
Goliad	378	7,000.8
Gonzales	1,332	23,465.5
Gray	215	3,595.0
Grayson	3,293	67,628.7
Gregg	417	3,109.9
Grimes	1,046	20,659.3
Guadalupe	1,623	31,671.8
Hale	1,819	89,624.0
Hall	1,072	102,817.7
Hamilton	1,187	13,059.1
Hardeman	745	36,676.9
Hardin	19	53.9
Harris	347	5,193.7
Harrison	2,249	25,876.4
Haskell	1,868	119,263.6
Hays	383	11,065.1
Hemphill	80	1,673.2
Henderson	2,108	15,578.4
Hidalgo	5,962	142,173.3
Hill	3,844	157,521.0
Hockley	1,902	200,379.5
Hood	392	3,382.3
Hopkins	2,836	48,447.0
Houston	2,169	32,311.2
Howard	810	87,555.7
Hudspeth	129	15,145.0
Hunt	4,257	143,679.5
Irion	24	788.5
Jack	276	3,205.9
Jackson	707	17,761.1
Jasper	402	870.1
Jefferson	50	329.9
Jim Hogg	109	2,200.6
Jim Wells	869	25,925.0
Johnson	1,673	46,133.5
Jones	1,997	101,670.1
Karnes	1,662	44,431.8
Kaufman	2,577	95,007.5
Kendall	1	5.0
Kenedy	1	10.0
Kent	383	23,482.6
Kerr	3	11.4
Kimble	44	237.7
King	82	11,523.0
Kinney	3	290.0
Kleberg	314	8,894.5
Knox	997	71,804.6
Lamar	2,450	98,829.3
Lamb	2,471	186,700.4
Lampasas	372	3,347.5
La Salle	95	2,122.3
Lavaca	3,088	42,553.5
Lee	1,296	12,390.3
Leon	1,111	15,181.5
Liberty	382	3,446.9
Limestone	2,038	101,900.8
Live Oak	802	19,144.3
Llano	66	411.9
Loving	15	420.0
Lubbock	2,605	247,849.8
Lynn	1,632	198,905.3
McCulloch	636	16,776.4
McLennan	3,442	121,392.6
McMullen	74	1,596.4
Madison	679	9,752.9
Marion	891	5,086.2
Martin	795	99,023.3
Mason	145	1,249.1
Matagorda	762	16,758.5
Maverick	186	7,922.0
Medina	89	569.0
Menard	74	647.9
Midland	341	23,757.5
Milam	2,245	63,902.0
Mills	369	3,113.3
Mitchell	1,022	67,784.1
Montague	857	6,840.1
Montgomery	308	1,558.9
Morris	887	7,241.5
Motley	512	38,779.2
Nacogdoches	1,682	13,575.1
Navarro	3,304	139,335.4
Newton	337	715.6
Nolan	747	41,296.8

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Texas—Continued		
Nueces	1,711	99,588.9
Palo Pinto	269	3,138.5
Panola	1,969	19,182.1
Parker	510	3,272.9
Parmer	205	5,143.3
Pecos	282	17,110.0
Polk	434	4,893.2
Presidio	118	2,720.6
Rains	827	14,031.5
Reagan	18	593.1
Red River	2,006	51,331.9
Reeves	251	20,854.8
Refugio	304	11,936.4
Robertson	1,079	39,372.9
Rockwall	717	32,676.0
Russell	1,770	89,754.1
Rusk	2,967	26,402.5
Sabine	426	3,380.5
San Augustine	743	8,270.8
San Jacinto	426	3,491.5
San Patricio	1,137	71,557.2
San Saba	712	8,667.2
Schleicher	141	8,969.4
Scurry	1,234	85,307.1
Schackelford	210	2,955.9
Shelby	2,482	18,040.7
Smith	2,685	17,599.6
Somervell	196	1,906.2
Starr	1,268	25,910.2
Stephens	126	1,060.0
Sterling	7	80.3
Stonewall	483	24,076.8
Swisher	556	11,785.4
Tarrant	591	16,469.6
Taylor	1,353	36,656.6
Terrell	1	78.0
Terry	1,352	122,865.8
Throckmorton	255	5,979.8
Titus	1,229	10,415.2
Tom Green	837	56,975.9
Travis	1,282	49,487.6
Trinity	623	4,784.6
Tyler	149	526.9
Upshur	1,577	10,179.4
Uvalde	19	136.5
Val Verde	1	46.6
Van Zandt	2,601	39,234.1
Victoria	1,010	25,962.2
Walker	848	7,837.6
Waller	516	7,254.7
Ward	174	11,501.3
Washington	2,410	34,285.0
Webb	68	1,370.8
Wharton	2,407	81,361.2
Wheeler	952	33,861.1
Wichita	523	10,261.4
Wilbarger	1,232	66,818.2
Willacy	1,227	107,792.5
Williamson	3,612	141,444.0
Wilson	797	9,113.9
Wise	588	3,196.0
Wood	1,904	10,474.3
Yoakum	267	16,925.2
Young	584	10,896.3
Zapata	170	1,781.4
Zavala	153	6,344.6
State total	243,329	7,900,159.6
Virginia:		
Brunswick	1,497	4,437.1
Caroline	1	5.0
Charlotte	30	80.8
Chesterfield	5	5.4
Dinwiddie	266	520.5
Elizabeth City	1	.4
Greensville	1,138	5,865.3
Halifax	12	21.9
Isle of Wight	405	963.2
Lunenburg	212	525.2
Mecklenburg	1,171	3,969.5
Nansemond	1,285	3,740.1
Norfolk	50	125.5
Nottoway	5	5.0
Prince George	91	138.6
Princess Anne	15	34.6
Southampton	1,521	7,455.9
Surry	44	74.4
Sussex	855	2,934.6
State total	8,664	30,903.0

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties

ALABAMA	
The State	572,638
Autauga	5,788
Barbour	5,515

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties—Continued
ALABAMA—continued

Bibb	2,456
Blount	8,562
Bullock	4,056
Butler	5,058
Calhoun	2,845
Chambers	8,265
Cherokee	15,809
Chilton	5,315
Choctaw	1,932
Clarke	1,822
Clay	2,182
Cleburne	1,313
Coffee	9,647
Colbert	17,133
Conecuh	5,395
Coosa	770
Covington	8,888
Crenshaw	5,540
Cullman	23,234
Dale	3,378
Dallas	11,736
De Kalb	15,109
Elmore	12,272
Escambia	5,813
Etowah	5,506
Fayette	4,539
Franklin	6,779
Geneva	13,613
Greene	6,258
Hale	9,280
Henry	8,352
Houston	14,186
Jackson	9,544
Lamar	7,397
Lauderdale	16,324
Lawrence	27,292
Lee	5,673
Limestone	36,331
Lowndes	4,925
Macon	9,950
Madison	44,302
Marengo	9,116
Marion	8,089
Marshall	17,716
Monroe	7,412
Montgomery	5,757
Morgan	19,690
Perry	5,851
Pickens	9,430
Pike	7,727
Randolph	6,915
Russell	4,297
St. Clair	2,529
Shelby	2,996
Sumter	6,872
Talladega	5,750
Tallapoosa	5,314
Tuscaloosa	10,845
Walker	3,233
Wilcox	4,336
Winston	4,010
All other	4,669

ARIZONA

The State	467,142
Graham	27,103
Maricopa	183,442
Pima	25,102
Pinal	220,555
All other	10,940

ARKANSAS

The State	1,072,005
Arkansas	6,841
Ashley	20,430
Bradley	2,376
Calhoun	1,639
Chicot	23,027
Clark	1,591
Clay	24,746
Cleveland	2,523
Columbia	5,916
Conway	2,542
Craighead	56,725

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties—Continued
ARKANSAS—continued

Crittenden	94,939
Cross	36,968
Desha	36,688
Drew	9,653
Faulkner	6,676
Grant	575
Greene	23,236
Hempstead	4,819
Howard	1,246
Independence	2,460
Izard	360
Jackson	34,235
Jefferson	65,012
Lafayette	9,628
Lawrence	12,732
Lee	48,502
Lincoln	29,117
Little River	3,447
Lonoke	35,601
Miller	5,460
Mississippi	160,970
Monroe	25,726
Nevada	1,773
Ouachita	1,022
Phillips	51,964
Poinsett	76,511
Pope	1,022
Prairie	8,311
Pulaski	13,851
Randolph	4,917
St. Francis	68,105
Sharp	975
Union	893
White	10,610
Woodruff	27,142
Yell	3,407
All other	5,096

CALIFORNIA

The State	981,910
Fresno	288,694
Kern	291,297
Kings	126,355
Madera	58,613
Merced	29,603
Tulare	180,505
All other	6,843

FLORIDA

The State	13,979
-----------	--------

GEORGIA

The State	490,363
-----------	---------

Baldwin	1,712
Banks	2,612
Barrow	3,877
Bartow	10,035
Ben Hill	1,811
Bleckley	5,827
Brooks	3,613
Bulloch	9,640
Calhoun	2,650
Burke	17,843
Butts	3,531
Candler	4,334
Carroll	5,689
Chattooga	1,061
Cherokee	175
Clarke	1,328
Cobb	310
Coffee	2,496
Colquitt	12,346
Coweta	4,896
Crisp	5,759
Dodge	8,726
Dooly	10,821
Early	7,392
Elbert	5,762
Emanuel	8,379
Fayette	3,564
Floyd	3,636
Forsyth	656
Franklin	6,831
Fulton	1,184
Glascock	2,146

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

GEORGIA—continued	
Gordon	4,598
Greene	1,757
Gwinnett	2,593
Hall	833
Hancock	3,972
Haralson	1,159
Harris	1,502
Hart	8,732
Henry	7,867
Houston	3,257
Irwin	5,602
Jackson	8,123
Jasper	3,321
Jefferson	10,158
Jenkins	6,669
Johnson	9,004
Lamar	1,745
Laurens	17,830
Lowndes	1,265
McDuffie	3,823
Macon	6,989
Madison	7,900
Meriwether	8,644
Mitchell	6,061
Montgomery	2,237
Morgan	10,868
Murray	885
Newton	5,199
Oconee	5,057
Oglethorpe	4,586
Paulding	1,406
Pike	4,089
Polk	2,328
Pulaski	5,103
Richmond	1,261
Rockdale	1,806
Schley	2,572
Screven	9,436
Spalding	2,354
Sumter	7,438
Taliaferro	1,028
Tattnall	2,259
Taylor	4,093
Telfair	2,145
Terrell	7,506
Thomas	1,796
Tift	3,510
Toombs	4,396
Troup	1,094
Turner	3,006
Walker	885
Walton	14,451
Warren	6,142
Washington	8,000
Whitfield	889
Wilcox	6,111
Wilkes	2,700
Wilkinson	693
Worth	8,656
All other	50,227

ILLINOIS

The State..... 1,302

KENTUCKY

The State..... 5,898

LOUISIANA

The State..... 418,978

Acadia	11,188
Avoyelles	16,385
Blenville	1,941
Bossier	22,682
Caddo	39,116
Catahoula	6,665
Claborn	4,578
Concordia	7,658
De Soto	4,165
East Carroll	18,105
East Feliciana	1,495
Evangeline	13,213
Franklin	33,349
Grant	2,398
Lafayette	11,925
Lincoln	1,724
Madison	15,867

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

LOUISIANA—continued	
Morehouse	23,016
Natchitoches	22,457
Cusachita	10,731
Pointe Coupee	6,275
Rapides	14,455
Red River	9,189
Richland	29,710
Sabine	1,174
St. Landry	23,300
St. Martin	5,732
Tensas	3,265
Union	4,838
Vermilion	3,047
Washington	3,749
Webster	17,670
West Carroll	363
Winn	11,289
All other	16,264

MISSISSIPPI

The State..... 1,307,412

Adams	971
Alcorn	6,978
Amite	5,864
Attala	8,211
Benton	6,113
Bolivar	123,603
Calhoun	8,543
Carroll	9,873
Chickasaw	9,423
Choctaw	2,768
Claborn	2,887
Clarke	3,610
Clay	5,010
Coahoma	93,660
Copiah	4,185
Covington	5,839
De Soto	25,593
Forrest	595
Grenada	9,906
Hinds	17,888
Holmes	28,765
Humphreys	45,256
Issaquena	9,519
Itawamba	6,650
Jasper	5,529
Jefferson	2,688
Jefferson Davis	9,987
Jones	7,309
Kemper	5,632
Lafayette	9,908
Lamar	1,793
Lauderdale	3,706
Lawrence	4,208
Leake	11,645
Lee	13,987
Leflore	85,854
Lincoln	3,611
Lowndes	9,781
Madison	20,793
Marion	5,933
Marshall	16,972
Monroe	16,853
Montgomery	4,113
Neshoba	11,543
Newton	7,823
Noxubee	11,344
Oktibbeha	2,079
Panola	26,037
Pike	2,888
Pontotoc	10,395
Prentiss	10,057
Quitman	58,628
Rankin	5,958
Scott	7,602
Sharkey	24,624
Simpson	8,846
Smith	8,706
Sunflower	123,808
Tallahatchie	49,397
Tate	17,676
Tippah	8,173
Tishomingo	3,761
Tunica	52,072
Union	8,717
Walthall	7,038
Warren	5,172

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

MISSISSIPPI—continued	
Washington	86,977
Wayne	3,858
Webster	6,092
Winston	8,576
Yalobusha	5,780
Yazoo	36,796
All other	4,877

MISSOURI

The State..... 266,040

Butler	10,113
Dunklin	63,315
Mississippi	19,074
New Madrid	66,173
Pemiscot	68,184
Scott	11,344
Stoddard	26,567
All other	1,270

NEW MEXICO

The State..... 188,506

Chaves	42,851
Dona Ana	76,343
Eddy	35,868
Lea	10,859
All other	22,585

NORTH CAROLINA

The State..... 189,656

Anson	9,026
Bertie	1,602
Bladen	1,113
C. barrus	2,553
Catawba	1,696
Chowan	568
Cleveland	18,560
Cumberland	4,614
Duplin	1,232
Edgecombe	3,319
Franklin	2,786
Gaston	1,517
Gates	799
Greene	1,050
Halifax	7,058
Harnett	4,728
Hoke	7,249
Iredell	7,237
Johnston	8,233
Lee	475
Lenoir	614
Lincoln	4,240
Martin	721
Mecklenburg	4,876
Nash	4,390
Northampton	6,181
Perquimans	304
Pitt	1,337
Polk	484
Richmond	3,563
Robeson	21,397
Rowan	5,716
Rutherford	2,279
Sampson	7,354
Scotland	10,649
Stanly	1,274
Union	8,209
Wake	1,786
Warren	2,207
Wayne	4,696
Willson	2,452
All other	9,512

OKLAHOMA

The State..... 242,293

Beckham	19,936
Blaine	3,561
Bryan	1,292
Caddo	12,230
Canadian	2,986
Choctaw	653
Comanche	2,819
Cotton	4,872
Creek	99

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

OKLAHOMA—continued

Custer	7,613
Dewey	1,737
Garvin	884
Grady	3,985
Greer	14,836
Harmon	17,626
Haskell	442
Hughes	117
Jackson	22,847
Jefferson	3,916
Kiowa	21,593
Le Flore	762
Lincoln	142
Logan	505
McClain	1,719
McCurtain	2,314
McIntosh	1,127
Muskogee	2,541
Okfuskee	594
Okmulgee	474
Osage	732
Pawnee	548
Payne	418
Pittsburg	488
Roger Mills	6,195
Stephens	600
Tillman	33,886
Wagoner	1,097
Washita	40,694
All other	3,913

SOUTH CAROLINA

The State

Abbeville	4,869
Aiken	13,218
Allendale	5,993
Anderson	16,763
Bamberg	6,712
Barnwell	9,938
Calhoun	10,668
Cherokee	4,462
Chester	6,311
Chesterfield	15,555
Clarendon	20,975
Colleton	3,231
Darlington	18,282
Dillon	10,957
Dorchester	6,070
Edgefield	7,246
Fairfield	3,153
Florence	12,833
Greenville	7,151
Greenwood	2,675
Hampton	4,331
Kershaw	7,988
Lancaster	3,475
Laurens	13,068
Lee	22,849
Lexington	5,819
McCormick	2,039
Marion	5,366
Marlboro	26,892
Newberry	6,781
Oconee	5,185
Orangeburg	38,078
Pickens	3,357
Richland	3,548
Saluda	5,753
Spartanburg	11,847
Sumter	25,473
Union	3,618
Williamsburg	15,670
York	8,549
All other	7,204

TENNESSEE

The State

Benton	1,757
Carroll	15,966
Chester	5,264
Crockett	25,139
Decatur	1,458
Dyer	26,698

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

TENNESSEE—continued

Fayette	25,143
Franklin	3,581
Gibson	35,408
Giles	4,788
Hardeman	10,848
Hardin	3,486
Haywood	36,563
Henderson	9,135
Henry	4,150
Lake	21,674
Lauderdale	31,208
Lawrence	10,177
Lincoln	8,034
McNairy	6,902
Madison	24,234
Obion	7,883
Rutherford	4,602
Shelby	28,887
Tipton	38,969
Weakley	6,976
All other	5,414

TEXAS

The State

Anderson	2,030
Angelina	1,309
Austin	6,699
Bailey	6,355
Bastrop	4,381
Baylor	4,878
Bee	2,485
Bell	34,424
Bexar	1,070
Bosque	3,664
Bowie	3,153
Brazoria	6,274
Brazos	10,603
Briscoe	3,785
Brown	931
Burleson	17,611
Burnet	1,443
Caldwell	9,611
Calhoun	9,309
Cameron	137,557
Cass	2,436
Cherokee	2,731
Childress	16,398
Clay	1,672
Cochran	12,976
Coleman	7,023
Collin	23,308
Collingsworth	19,089
Colorado	3,704
Cooke	883
Coryell	6,352
Cottle	24,213
Crosby	46,922
Dallas	13,250
Dawson	93,010
Delta	12,535
Denton	5,507
De Witt	6,434
Dickens	19,610
Donley	5,198
Duval	1,456
Ellis	65,711
El Paso	67,132
Erath	1,546
Falls	41,840
Fannin	7,293
Fayette	10,751
Fisher	39,416
Floyd	23,971
Foard	4,109
Fort Bend	32,419
Frestone	5,207
Gaines	11,799
Garza	17,405
Gonzales	4,823
Grayson	3,013
Grimes	7,484
Guadalupe	8,549
Hale	51,535
Hall	30,987
Hamilton	1,840
Hardeman	8,846

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

TEXAS—continued

Harris	1,198
Harrison	2,477
Haskell	67,789
Hays	3,045
Hidalgo	105,691
Hill	54,953
Hockley	75,040
Hopkins	6,570
Houston	8,669
Howard	49,158
Hudspeth	21,514
Hunt	19,910
Jackson	6,957
Jim Wells	4,833
Johnson	14,394
Jones	38,501
Karnes	10,245
Kaufman	22,993
Kent	8,601
King	5,057
Knox	31,481
Lamar	12,098
Lamb	57,524
Lavaca	12,602
Lee	2,482
Leon	3,162
Liberty	1,413
Limestone	30,126
Live Oak	4,413
Lubbock	154,438
Lynn	88,780
McCulloch	3,029
McLennan	39,640
Madison	2,543
Martin	46,317
Matagorda	7,307
Maverick	8,984
Midland	4,935
Milam	21,137
Mitchell	38,570
Morris	529
Motley	8,662
Nacogdoches	1,983
Navarro	45,257
Nolan	20,106
Nueces	45,449
Panola	1,675
Pecos	9,703
Red River	5,171
Reeves	33,910
Refugio	5,793
Robertson	16,911
Rockwall	7,200
Runnels	28,706
Rusk	3,013
San Augustine	1,889
San Patricio	33,777
Scurry	35,040
Shelby	2,040
Smith	1,861
Starr	3,763
Stonewall	8,831
Tarrant	3,260
Taylor	10,974
Terry	43,216
Throckmorton	2,987
Tom Green	26,112
Travis	15,691
Trinity	1,848
Van Zandt	6,066
Victoria	11,348
Walker	2,134
Waller	2,082
Ward	6,672
Washington	9,892
Wharton	37,850
Wheeler	5,005
Wichita	1,209
Willbarger	18,609
Willacy	79,781
Williamson	51,257
Wilson	1,490
Wood	418
Young	2,615
All other	68,405

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties—Continued

VIRGINIA	
The State.....	4,624
Brunswick.....	614
Greensville.....	613
Mecklenburg.....	720
Nansemond.....	611
Southampton.....	1,522
All other.....	544

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include a speech he made on foreign policy of the United States before the Montana Bar Association on June 30, 1951.

Mr. RIVERS and to include a sermon.

Mr. KILDAY and to include a portion of a broadcast by Mr. Bill Downs over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an article.

Mr. BRYSON and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include some news items.

Mr. MORANO and to include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL, Mr. MEADER, and Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. AYRES in two instances and to include a letter.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. Bow and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOEVEN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BERRY and to include a telegram from Harry J. Devereaux to Eric Johnston.

Mr. SHAFER in three instances.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include an address by General Eisenhower.

Mr. RIBICOFF and to include a speech by Jesse W. Randall.

Mrs. BOSONE and to include excerpts from a letter received by her.

Mr. GREEN and to include an article by James B. Carey that appeared in Labor and Nation, spring 1951 issue.

Mr. RHODES and to include a radio address delivered by him.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include an article from the Herald-Tribune.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURDICK and to include a short article from the National Grange.

Mr. MCKINNON in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCGREGOR in two instances and to include in one an article by Louis Bromfield and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. LECOMPTTE and to include a statement on the price-control bill by Mr. Zed Hughes, of Corydon, Iowa, appearing in the Corydon (Iowa) Times-Republican on July 5.

Mr. SADLAK in two instances and to include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. POULSON in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER and to include a few telegrams.

Mr. BECKWORTH and to include two articles.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER to revise and extend his remarks on the Hope amendment and to include a tabulation of figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture on farm income for the month of May 1951.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN to revise and extend and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND to revise and extend and to include pertinent correspondence and other material.

Mr. DORN and to include a certain article.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday July 11, 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:

596. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422) so as to provide for the appointment of special policemen by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

597. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1696. An act to amend Public Law 587 of the Eighty-first Congress (approved June 30, 1950) to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien shepherders; with amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2976. A bill relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management; with amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3883. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone

on the public domain; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4288. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 210. Joint Resolution to provide a 1-year extension of the 5-year limitation on the time for presenting Indian claims to the Indian Claims Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 692). 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. MORRIS: Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3838. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett; without amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3840. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 688). 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. ROONEY:

H. R. 4740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 4741. A bill to create the Postal Service as an establishment of the Government accountable only to the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4742. A bill to provide for appointments to positions of rural carrier in the postal service without regard to political affiliation and to prescribe a penalty with respect to solicitation of political contributions from applicants for such positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4743. A bill to amend section 602 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to solicitation of political contributions from applicants for Federal employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 4744. A bill to provide for the construction of a suitable building for the Veterans' Administration regional office at Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4745. A bill imposing penalties upon officials or others who make public the names of persons on welfare relief rolls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4746. A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 4747. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting

blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 4748. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4749. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the police jury of Caddo Parish, La.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4750. A bill to increase penalties for the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 4751. A bill to provide for the construction of a suitable building for the Veterans' Administration regional office at Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 4752. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 4753. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4754. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Brooklyn; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution to express the disapproval of the Congress of the arrest and conviction of Archbishop Josef Groesz of Hungary and of William N. Oatis, correspondent for the Associated Press in Prague, and of similar instances of personal, religious, and political persecution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 4755. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4756. A bill for the relief of George Francis Hammers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Vernelle V. Caruthers and Linda Ann Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 4758. A bill for the relief of Donald James Darmody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4759. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Farrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Irene Prolos (nee Vagianos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 4761. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth M. Casey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. Res. 319. Resolution for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage,

or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; 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:

341. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging the United States Congress to make necessary changes in the Federal Civil Defense Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

342. Also, resolution of the Allied Veterans Council of Wayne County, Mich., urging the United States Congress to make necessary financial appropriation for civil defense which will grant city of Detroit sufficient money to purchase necessary air raid warning sirens; to the Committee on Armed Services.

343. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Wyandotte, Mich., urging appropriation of necessary funds to deposit the dredged materials from the River Rouge in a location which does not endanger the health of any of the communities on the Detroit River; to the Committee on Public Works.

344. Also, resolution of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging legislation giving Korean veterans same GI bill of rights as those enjoyed by veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

345. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thad Fusco, city clerk, Cleveland, Ohio, relative to requesting the repeal of the regulation deferring college students who attain certain grades, or pass special aptitude tests, from military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

346. By Mr. HOPE: Resolution of the First Baptist Church of Lakin, Kans., urging that all grains and fruits now used for the manufacture of all distilled, fermented, and malt beverages be diverted to purposes which are useful in our national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 27, 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:

Lord God Almighty, who amidst the shifting sands of time standest sure: Like men who turn from dusty toil to the cleansing of crystal streams, so we lift our soiled faces to Thee, from the perplexities and imperfections which crowd the common days. As we pause now in reverent silence, let this high place of the Nation's life, so great a factor in tomorrow's pattern for all men, become the audience chamber of Thy presence. Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from the hearts of men and because out of the heart are the issues of life, we pray for ourselves. May we stand in this holy place with pure hearts and clean hands. Purify our hearts by Thy grace, feed our minds with Thy truth, guide our feet in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 10, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 360. An act for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene;

S. 470. An act for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska; and

S. 1229. An act for the relief of Jan Josef Wleckowski and his wife and daughter.

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

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Hendryk Kempski;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu;

H. R. 581. An act for the relief of Isabel Tabit;

H. R. 608. An act for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo;

H. R. 623. An act for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer;

H. R. 627. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane;

H. R. 677. An act for the relief of Ramute Alexandra Vallokaitis;

H. R. 744. An act for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki;

H. R. 796. An act for the relief of Roy F. Wilson;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins;

H. R. 870. An act for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Antonios Charalambou;

H. R. 982. An act for the relief of Willem Smits;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta);

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer;

H. R. 1454. An act for the relief of George Crisan;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovschi (also known as Hanoh Charat), Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovschi (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovschi;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of James J. Lieberman;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Hoshi Kazuo;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Guy Christian;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of Sister M. Crocefissa and Sister M. Reginalda;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Sister M. Leonida;

H. R. 2275. An act for the relief of J. Alfred Pullham;

H. R. 2292. An act for the relief of Jal Young Lee;