District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6712. A bill to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6713. A bill to authorize a further preliminary examination and a new survey of the Spring Creek, North and South Branches, which flows into the Marsh River, a tributary of the Red River of the North, Norman County, State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6714. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6715. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 to include the State of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS (by request):

H. R. 6716. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6717. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of the reclamation fund for the cost of the construction and certain costs of operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system adjacent to the Yuma Federal irrigation project in Arizona and California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution to suspend commercial relations with Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution suspending commercial relations between the United States and Lebanon; 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. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6718. A bill for the relief of Jeptha R. Macfarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6719. A bill for the relief of Manuel Barrios, his wife, Elvira Barrios, and infant son, Gerardo Barrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6720. A bill for the relief of Fe'R. Dumaguing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6721. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lazanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6722. A bill to authorize the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to hear and determine a motion for a new trial for Thomas Jordon; 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:

2017. By Mr. HART: Petition of Union City Post, No. 46, of the American Legion, protesting further shipment of potential war materials to the Soviet Union and its satellite nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2018. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the German Sick Beneficial Society of Mansfield, Ohio, with reference to the amendment of House bill 6163; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2019. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Wirt Henry Ferguson urging Congress to establish a policy to halt aggressive expansion of the present Russian Government and its satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2020. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Kish and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2021. Also, petition of Micheal T. Nevaloney and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of legislation which would provide for the admission of our share of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2022. Also, petition of Glendale American Legion Post, No. 127, California, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of legislation for increase in compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 20, 1948)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, as Thou dost move among people and see what men are doing today, how sore must be Thy heart.

Thou whose head was cradled in straw must often reflect that straw was not as coarse as man's selfishness.

Thou whose hands were spread upon a cross and fastened with nails must often reflect that nails were never so sharp as man's ingratitude.

Hear us as we pray for this poor blundering world, in which the nations never seem to learn how to live as brothers.

They resort again and again to methods that produce only more bitter tears, methods that only add to misery and subtract nothing from problems.

Heal them that need healing, make strong the wavering, guide the perplexed, befriend the lonely, give new faith and courage to those whose spirits are low.

Lift up our heads, put a new light in our eyes and a new song in our hearts, and we will do better and be better for the sake of Thy love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, May 26, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 26, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 1979. An act authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6407) to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. LEA, and Mr. PRIEST were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5874) to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6071) to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6096. An act making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore;

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 1 and the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 2;

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5874. An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

(The following request by Mr. FERGUSON was inadvertently omitted from the RECORD of Wednesday, May 26, 1948:)

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the Committee

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

on Appropriations be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate until the completion of the hearings on the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered.

MURDER OF GEORGE W. POLK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD copy of a letter which I have sent to the Secretary of State regarding the shocking murder of George W. Polk, chief correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System in the Middle East, whose body was found, bound hand and foot, floating in the bay at Salonika in Greece.

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

MAY 22, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This week the body of George W. Polk, chief correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System in the Middle East, was found, bound hand and foot, floating in the bay at Salonika in Greece. According to newspaper accounts, he had been shot in the back of the head.

You will agree with me, I believe, that it is of the utmost importance that the American people be acquainted with all of the facts in this tragic case, and it is to that end that I send you this letter.

In addition to an investigation and disclosure of the facts, I should like to know precisely what steps the State Department is taking in this matter. Is an official inquiry under way to determine and fix responsibility for this reporter's death? Is the Government of Greece cooperating in this inquiry? Has it been determined that Mr. Polk's death was due to the negligence of the Greek Government? If so, is the Greek Government prepared to take appropriate action?

I hope that you will give this matter your personal attention and that I may expect to have a report at the earliest possible time.

Very sincerely yours,
HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as part of this insertion, I ask that there be printed a resolution adopted by the executive committee of Overseas Writers, and a press release which was issued by Mr. Walter Lippmann, chairman of the committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk, and by Ernest K. Lindley, president of the Overseas Writers, together with a list of the names of the members of the committee appointed to inquire into the murder of George Polk.

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

Resolution by the executive committee of Overseas Writers appointing a committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk

Whereas the murder of George Polk while carrying out his duties as an American reporter in a foreign country is of grave concern to American writers;

Resolved, That a committee appointed by the president of Overseas Writers is directed to determine whether a full and complete inquiry into all the circumstances of the crime is being conducted;

And is therefore authorized to call upon the Secretary of State, the Ambassador of Greece, and the Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece, Governor Dwight Griswold;

And is also directed to receive evidence submitted from any other sources;

And when this preliminary inquiry has been completed, the committee is directed to report to the president and the executive committee of Overseas Writers whether other measures are necessary to uncover the whole truth.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY WALTER LIPPMANN, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE MURDER OF GEORGE POLK, AND BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY, PRESIDENT, OVERSEAS WRITERS

Gen. William J. Donovan, organizer and director of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, has consented to serve as counsel to the committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk.

Statement by Mr. Lippmann: "The committee feels that General Donovan's acceptance of this invitation will give the American public in general and the newspaper, radio, and magazine professions confidence that the inquiry will be thorough and penetrating. It goes without saying, I hope, that General Donovan, like the members of the committee, is serving without compensation."

The committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk was appointed by authority of a resolution of the executive committee of Overseas Writers. It is directed to determine whether a full and complete inquiry into all the circumstances of the crime is being conducted, to receive evidence from official and private sources, and to report * * * whether other measures are necessary to uncover the whole truth.

A list of the members of the committee is attached.

COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE MURDER OF GEORGE POLK

Walter Lippmann, columnist, New York Herald Tribune Syndicate, chairman.

Marquis Childs, columnist, United Features Syndicate, vice chairman.

Phelps Adams, chief, Washington bureau, New York Sun.

Morgan Beatty, commentator, National Broadcasting Co.

Elmer Davis, commentator, American Broadcasting Co.

Peter Edson, columnist, Newspaper Enterprise Association.

Robert Elson, chief, Washington bureau, Time and Life.

Benjamin M. McKelway, editor, Washington Evening Star.

Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board, Washington Post.

Relman Morin, chief, Washington bureau, Associated Press.

James Reston, New York Times.

Albert L. Warner, chief, Washington news bureau, Mutual Broadcasting System.

Lyle C. Wilson, chief, Washington bureau, United Press.

Ex officio

Ernest K. Lindley, Washington editor, Newsweek; president of Overseas Writers.

Joseph C. Harsch, news analyst, Columbia Broadcasting System; secretary of Overseas Writers.

Paul Wooton, New Orleans Times-Picayune; treasurer of Overseas Writers.

REPORT OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(For text of President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 6598.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 161)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmiting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Justice in the form of an amendment to the budget for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF SUBMARINE CHASER TO VALLEY FORGE MILITARY ACADEMY FOUNDATION, WAYNE, PA.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Valley Forge Military Academy Foundation, of Wayne, Pa., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a submarine chaser for use by that organization for student training purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTRACT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND INDIANS OF FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a contract by and between the United States and the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Montana Stock Growers' Association, at Bozeman, Mont., favoring the enactment of legislation giving that association a voice in wage controversies under the Railway Labor Act, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5965. A bill to amend paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421); and

H. R. 6242. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416).

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

S 2186. A bill to amend section 5 of the Act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1415).

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

H. R. 6078. A bill to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2675. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1418);

H. R. 5587. A bill to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417);

H. R. 5816. A bill to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1419); and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam; with amendments (Rept. No. 1420).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Charles Franklin Brannan, of Colorado, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Robert L. Shivers, of Honolulu, T. H., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H. (reappointment).

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

Robert C. Burns, to be a lieutenant colonel in the Regular Marine Corps; William E. Bonds to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps, and Edward R. Carney and sundry other officers to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps;

Augustine A. Albanese, and sundry others for appointment in the Navy; and

John H. Dayton and sundry other retired officers for advancement on the retired list of the Navy to the rank of vice admiral.

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

Roulhac Gewin, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama; and

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of April 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
May 13, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1948, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona V. MacKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW.; Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, $5,905.20.

Fedele F. Fauri, 3227 Northampton Street NW., Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; annual salary, $9,975.

Martha D. Ring, 3510 Morrison Street NW.; Division of Public Health Methods, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, $6,623.40.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. REED:

S. 2757. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECTON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 2758. A bill to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2759. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post office building at Bunker Hill, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2760. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes;

S. 2761. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes;

S. 2762. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Air Engineering Development Center, and for other purposes; and

S. 2763. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2764. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 2765, to amend the Public Health Service Act, 79th Cong., ch. 538, 2d sess., to provide for Federal inspection of institutions, State mental health authorities, and hospitals who obtain grants of money, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6096. An act making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY RELATING TO PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY INSURANCE (S. DOC. NO. 162)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I present a report of the Advisory Council on Social Security, relating to permanent and total disability insurance made to the Senate Committee on Finance, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him regarding Senate Joint Resolution 200, together with a copy of the joint resolution, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ADDRESS TO TEXANS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at Fort Worth, Tex., on May 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIVING: 1948—ADDRESS BY GOV. EARL WARREN, OF CALIFORNIA

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Living—1948, delivered by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, on May 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—EDITORIAL FROM THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of statehood for Hawaii, published in the Honolulu Advertiser, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate this afternoon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Mr. IVES asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to sit this afternoon for the purpose of holding a hearing.

Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Foreign Relations to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee investigating

the shortage of oil and petroleum products to sit and hold a hearing during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Oil and Steel of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business to sit during the session of the Senate today.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

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

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

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

Aiken	George	Millikin
Baldwin	Green	Moore
Barkley	Gurney	Morse
Brewster	Hatch	Murray
Bricker	Hawkes	O'Conor
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Buck	Hill	Reed
Butler	Holland	Revercomb
Byrd	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	White
Feazel	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Wilson
Fulbright	Maybank	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

INVESTIGATION OF VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAMS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution. I ask for immediate consideration, that the clerk read the resolution, and that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair assumes that the Senator is not asking for immediate consideration in the Senate of the resolution itself, but is asking for immediate consideration of its reference.

Mr. CAPEHART. Reference to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 245) was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Whereas the attention of the Senate has been called to certain allegations against the radio-broadcast operations of the State Department and certain radio networks under Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, commonly known as the Voice of America program; and

Whereas these allegations, if true, present a condition so critical in our interstate and foreign communications as to warrant the immediate attention of this body: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby gives unanimous approval to a full and complete investigation of these allegations by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1949: *Provided, however*, That the committee shall file an interim report of the findings of its preliminary investigation, together with its recommendations for any immediate legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate on or before June 15, 1948.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be given immediate consideration by the Senate when so requested by said committee in an amount sufficient to carry out the purpose of this resolution, which expenses shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if unanimous consent is being asked for consideration of the resolution, I shall have to interpose objection. I think it ought to be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Indiana is not asking for immediate consideration by the Senate of the resolution. He is asking immediate consideration of the question of reference of his resolution to a committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to ask immediate consideration. That is always in the province of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The Chair will have to state that under objection any consideration of the resolution—even the question of reference—would have to lie over for 1 day, without unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to the investigation. Of course I support it. But it is rather odd to submit a resolution announcing that the Senate does anything unanimously, in advance of action. Presuming on the unanimity of the Senate is a little out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must state that debate is not in order, under the Reorganization Act, on a question of this character. The only question before the Senate is whether it will give unanimous consent for the present reference of the resolution to a committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If unanimous consent is given, does that foreclose the right of any Senator to object to the reference?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If unanimous consent is given, under the terms of the Reorganization Act the Chair is required to make an immediate reference, without debate. But the reference is subject to an appeal, which is debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no idea that the Chair would make an erroneous reference of the resolution. Therefore I do not wish to be in the position of objecting to the Chair passing on the question. But I have very definite conclusions and opinions as to where the resolution should go.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none.

This is another of those very difficult situations which arise under the language of the Reorganization Act. In this instance at least three committees of the Senate could certainly sustain a color of right to consider the resolution. One of them is the Committee on Foreign Relations. Another is the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The third is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the presence of such a controversy the Chair is required to act under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, which reads as follows:

In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the presiding officer of the Senate without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

As has happened in a number of previous instances this session, the Chair

confronts the necessity of deciding in his own mind which committee has jurisdiction over "the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation." Therefore the problem is, What interest predominates as between the three rival committees?

In the present instance the Chair feels that the line of demarcation between at least two of these committees is very narrow. Therefore the Chair proposes, insofar as the rules permit, to submit the question of jurisdiction to the decision of the Senate itself.

Unfortunately, under the Reorganization Act, which in this respect is quite contrary to the previous rules of the Senate, the only way the Chair can submit the question to the Senate is to make a tentative reference in the first instance and then invite an appeal if the Senate disagrees with the reference. Therefore, solely for the purpose of initiating the process of permitting the Senate to decide, the Chair will make a tentative reference, which will be made without prejudice, and with the distinct understanding that so far as the Chair is concerned, he is merely embracing a mechanism for the purpose of allowing a free decision in the Senate.

The Chair finds that the interest of the Committee on Foreign Relations is not the predominating interest in this legislation, for what the Chair believes are obvious reasons. There is a more direct and specific predominance, in the Chair's view, in another committee.

In the view of the Chair, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce does not predominate, because in the tentative opinion of the Chair the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could arise only in respect to that committee's jurisdiction over radio; and it does not seem to the Chair that the radio phase, per se, of the pending problem predominates.

The Chair therefore tentatively rules that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, because under the Reorganization Act to that committee is committed the specific obligation of "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Therefore, if the Senate will have in mind what the Chair has said by way of introduction, namely, that this is purely a mechanism for the purpose of letting the Senate itself decide—the Chair rules, without prejudice to anyone or to any committee, that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That ruling is subject to appeal, and an appeal is subject to debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, tentatively I appeal——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have the floor; have I not?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Kentucky was recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, I feel that the Chair has rendered his decision in good faith. Yet I feel that the criticism which was indulged in and will be indulged in regarding this whole matter is and will be leveled against the State Department because of legislation which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senate is familiar with the course of that legislation over the last year, and the Senate is familiar with the fact that it was regarded as being of such importance that a joint committee of the two Houses was appointed and authorized to investigate the question of the Voice of America. It made a very detailed investigation in a number of countries, and came back here and proposed legislation was formulated in the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee reported the proposed legislation, and it was enacted. So this whole matter involves a law and the administration of a law by the State Department, and that law came from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I understand that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have over-all jurisdiction to investigate expenditures in all departments, regardless of the particular committee from which the legislation upon which the investigation is based may have emanated. Yet it seems to me that the committee which sponsored this program, which heard the witnesses who testified concerning it and which advocated the legislation, and in a sense is responsible for it, should make the investigation of any violation or any omission or any item of performance of the program by the Department, which certainly relies upon the Committee on Foreign Relations for legislation of this and all other kinds dealing with our foreign relations and our international program.

I have no doubt that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would conduct a fair and impartial investigation. Yet, under the circumstances, I feel that this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I realize that committee has a very large program, and probably in some respects it is overworked. It may be that the committee does not desire to have jurisdiction of this matter. I rather suspect that it does not. Nevertheless, it seems to me somewhat strange that the investigation should be taken away from that committee, because I have a feeling that if the same sort of investigation were to be carried on under a resolution by which the RFC or the Export-Import Bank or the Commodity Credit Corporation were to be investigated, the investigation would go to the committee which was responsible for the original legislation, because, in this instance, if legislation on this subject is necessary, it is bound to come from the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments cannot bring in a bill or any other proposed legislation dealing with the Voice of America and its program, which is a part of our international set-up.

So it seems to me that the Committee on Foreign Relations should have jurisdiction of this investigation, not because it will favor the State Department, or will be unfavorable to it, because I assume that any committee would wish to know the facts; certainly I wish to know them, I wish to know how all this happened, how it came about, who was responsible, whether it was the State Department or whether it was someone in the State Department, whether it was the officers of the National Broadcasting Co. or of any other broadcasting company. We wish to know the facts; we wish to obtain the truth about this matter.

I think the committee which sponsored the program and brought in the proposed legislation, and which therefore to some extent is subject to any criticism which may grow out of a lack of foresight in the proper framing of this legislation, should not be denied the opportunity to make the investigation.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I was tentatively appealing from the decision of the Chair. However, I shall not insist on the appeal. I wished to express my views about the matter, namely, that I think the Chair should have referred this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, for obvious reasons. Nevertheless, I shall not appeal from the decision the Chair has rendered.

However, I hope this reference will not be regarded as a precedent in connection with the reference of resolutions of this sort, so as to result in having them taken away from the committees which are responsible for the legislation and for the creation of the agency that is under attack.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Naturally, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I appreciate the remarks the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has made; and having been a member of that committee, and having been chairman of the subcommittee which had to do with this legislation, and having been chairman of the group which went abroad last summer in connection with the legislation, I naturally feel very intimately connected with it. But for that very reason, so far as I personally am concerned, I wish to make it clear for the RECORD that I support the position and decision of the Chair in making the reference of this resolution, because I think it would be a splendid thing to have another committee make a fresh start on this matter.

In the Foreign Relations Committee we have given a great deal of time and thought to this matter and this program. I should like to cooperate in every way I can with another committee in this connection, because of my background of knowledge of this matter. As I have said, I think it would be wise to

have the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments look into this matter, which the Foreign Relations Committee has worked on previously.

I appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky has said about possibly the natural jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations; but this matter is of such concern to every Member of the Senate and to the country at large that I personally should like to have an investigation made by a new group, in view of the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee has considered the matter from a slightly different angle.

I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether he thinks that would be a wise decision from the standpoint of our committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have withdrawn the appeal, which I had to take in order to be able to say what I have said about the matter. But I wish to say that I have not the slightest suspicion or fear that because the Committee on Foreign Relations sponsored this legislation in the first place, it would in any way be partial to or disposed to favor the State Department or anyone in it who had been guilty of any wrong doing or of any lack of appreciation of the problem thus faced. It may be that as a matter of general desirability, some other committee might be looked upon as likely to be a little more impartial than the Committee on Foreign Relations would be, but I do not think that is so.

However, having withdrawn the appeal, there is nothing further that I wish to say about it. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey, and I know how earnest and how diligent and how utterly disinterested he has been in his efforts to bring about the enactment of this law and to see that it is properly enforced. All of us are interested in that.

I have no doubt that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, who now is presiding over the Senate, is equally interested in seeing that this law is properly administered, so that there will be no reflection upon our country or any part of it or upon our program because of it. So I withdraw the appeal. But I did not want the opportunity to pass without saying that I still have faith in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to add my own word, that I of course have faith in my own committee, and that because of my personal relationship to this subject, I am eager for some committee to check up on the matter. We shall try to cooperate with them to the end of bringing about a right result.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not wish to violate the proprieties by engaging in a discussion of the subject while in the Chair, but he would at least like permission to state that he shares with the Senator from Kentucky complete respect for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There is no disrespect involved in the Chair's decision.

The Chair wants to call to the attention of the Senate for its information the fact that the resolution in itself, by its text, requires the investigation to be made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to say first of all I very regretfully enter my appeal from the decision of the Chair on this matter, and I wish to say a very brief word about the situation. That word must be brief, because I have only known of the situation in the late minutes, and I have had no opportunity to refresh my recollection as to events or to study the present conditions and circumstances.

I appreciate fully, Mr. President, it often happens that jurisdiction overlaps and that the Chair might well be justified in making an assignment to any one of the three committees claiming jurisdiction. There is something of truth in the statement that that is the present situation.

I feel, however, that the claim of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate is the paramount problem involved. We are dealing with a subject matter, to be sure, that has some special significance to those interested in our foreign relations, but after all, Mr. President, all that is being done by way of investigation, all that will be done by way of investigation, is to make first of all, above all else, a study of the frequencies and the other means of communication to which the State Department asserts a right and in which it indulges.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to do as we have been doing without infringing or impinging upon the use of radio frequencies by many users in this country. There are already a number of companies engaged in foreign broadcasting of news of one sort and another. They are struggling all the while for frequencies to use in their operations. The State Department is doing the same thing. I do not have before me nor in my mind at the moment the extent to which the Foreign Service of the United States, the Department of State, utilizes broadcast frequencies in connection with this work. That, it seems to me, becomes first of all the great problem. It is not a question of how much money was spent by this committee or that committee; that is a trivial consequence when we consider the other questions involved. The real basic problem is the use of communication facilities, facilities by wire and facilities by air. In any investigation that is made those are the subjects which will engage the attention of a committee, if the committee has the jurisdiction which it ought to have and must have if it is to make a study of that character.

Mr. President, this morning the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce authorized a complete investigation of all phases of the situation, including in particular the extent to which radio facilities may be used or ought to be used by the State Department instead of being utilized by other agencies of news transmission. We face that, I believe, as the great problem involved here. When all the investigating is concluded, it will be found, Mr. President, that the most difficult question to solve is the question of the use of radio frequencies and radio facilities. From time immemorial the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had jurisdiction over those matters and over all the agencies of transmission.

Reference has been made to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations acted on the original bill. It was not a unanimous vote because I happened to have very definite feelings about it and voted against the report of the bill which came from the Foreign Relations Committee.

To those who may be interested, I venture the assertion that the difficulties which were disclosed as of yesterday on this floor are but the beginning of problems and difficulties, almost insurmountable in character, involving the policy of the United States and the tradition of the United States. I say those are all going to be involved unless we find out just what frequencies are being used, who is using them, for what purposes they are being used, and what advantages are accruing to the United States from their use.

Mr. President, I have rambled, but I feel very strongly that I ought to urge the appeal, both because I am so directed by members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and above all because I believe this is a matter which should go to that committee which has, and always has had, jurisdiction over communication facilities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine appeals the decision of the Chair. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAPEHART. If we now take a vote on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, then, will a motion be in order to refer the resolution to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not. If the decision of the Chair is not sustained, the Chair will make a rereference, choosing between the two remaining committees. Again, an appeal may be taken, if the Senate is not satisfied.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I was present yesterday when the debate on this subject took place, and it was suggested then that such a resolution would be submitted, but I thought the Senator from Indiana agreed it should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I made the suggestion yesterday that I would offer a resolution today referring the questions involved to the Foreign Relations Committee for investigation. However, in the interim it developed that the matter had been tentatively referred, or might be referred, or that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had taken jurisdiction and might proceed to make the investigation. Even before I had an opportunity to submit the resolution, which I stated yesterday I would offer, that situation devel-

oped. Inasmuch as the present occupant of the chair, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has ruled that he does not think the Foreign Relations Committee should handle the resolution, in my opinion, it should be handled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which committee has jurisdiction over all radio and broadcasting matters.

Mr. CONNALLY. This, Mr. President, is not a matter of technical transmission by way of radio. It is not a question involving engineering and things of that sort. The question here is a matter of national or international policy. That is why it was raised. It affects the attitude of foreign governments toward the United States by reason of their sources of information being poisoned by the slanderous and libelous reports going out over the radio. The situation would be the same if they went out by newspaper. It is the matter of high international policy, and it seems to me the only proper place for the resolution to go is to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

That committee had jurisdiction of and acted upon the original resolution or statute, as the case may be, which authorized this service. From time to time the attention of that committee is being called to this particular service. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is a committee having jurisdiction of general expenditures. This matter is a specific national and international problem which cannot be properly dealt with, as I see it, except by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has jurisdiction of all our external relations and problems.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have information to the effect that the State Department is maintaining that the responsibility lies with the broadcasting companies. I hold in my hand——

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say that it rests with the broadcasting companies by warrant of the State Department's action in making contracts with the broadcasting company. So the State Department cannot wash its hands of responsibility.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator will yield further, I hold in my hand a volume of the hearings on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1948, and from page 1031 thereof I shall read a portion of the purported contract which the State Department made with the Columbia Broadcasting System. In my opinion, it indicates very definitely that the matter belongs to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because the contract places the responsibility upon that committee. The portion to which I refer reads as follows:

> The Department shall provide the contractor with general directives for each program to be prepared, produced, presented, transmitted, or broadcast by the contractor hereunder, indicating the general character of the programs and designating whether dramatic, music, news, etc., fixing the length of the programs, and the hour or hours, and the day or days of transmission. When such directives have been delivered to the contractor, the contractor, subject to the limitations expressed herein, shall assume full responsibility for complying with them and shall exercise complete authority over such preparation, production, presentation, transmission, and broadcast within the framework of such directives.

I do not know whether that is the contract which the State Department has with the broadcasting company. If it is, then the resolution should be referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee rather than to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is not a question of dollars and cents. It is not a technical question involving kilocycles and other kinds of cycles going out over the radio. That is technical. This is a matter of high international importance, and the Committee on Foreign Relations is the proper agency to look into it, because it is responsible, in a way, for the proper conduct of the service.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it the Senator's position that it belongs with the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

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

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I want to express my concurrence with the views of the Senator from Texas that there is a very strong case to be made out for the reference of the resolution to the Foreign Relations Committtee. Today it cleared with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which considered the matter this morning at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is a member of the committee, and the committee unanimously voted that the chairman of the committee [Mr. WHITE] should confer with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations regarding the matter before our committee took any further action. We authorized the appointment of a subcommittee to go into it, but recognized the very great claim which the Committee on Foreign Relations could make on the ground that the Senator from Texas has so well presented. Is it not clear, if the other position be taken, that because the expenditure of money is involved, which is clearly the case, therefore the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should proceed, there is not a single subject of any character concerned with any spending which that committee could not claim jurisdiction of under the theory which is advanced? The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is concerned with economy and efficiency, which words obviously emphasize the committee's concern over extravagance and waste, which is involved here, but which is no more involved than it is involved in every item of expense. Meanwhile, the question of foreign relations involves the question of broadcasting. There have been various rulings which have looked in that direction.

I am certainly happy to associate myself with the Senator from Texas in feeling that the ruling of the Chair in the first instance should not be sustained. Following that, the question of jurisdiction between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be properly considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Maine for his agreement with the views which the Senator from Texas has undertaken to present. If jurisdiction of the measure should be given to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments because the expenditure of money is involved, then every resolution affecting any department of the Government would have to go to that committee, because there is no activity that does not require money. Everything we appropriate for involves money. Therefore if a resolution on any subject within the Federal jurisdiction comes before the Senate, some wise Senator may adjust his glasses and say, "This matter ought to go to the Committee on Expenditures, because there is an expenditure involved."

I have the highest respect for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I do not want in any wise to criticize his sincerity, but I am wondering if some little feeling of modesty as chairman of that committee might not have unconsciously influenced him in referring the resolution to some other committee.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I call the Senator's attention to the language of the Reorganization Act, page 23, which seems to me to be very pertinent. I read from section 136:

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

In order to avoid conflict, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously agreed it would confer with the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. The radio part of the subject is simply an instrumentality. It does not reach the question of policy; it does not reach the question of what was in the mind of the persons who wrote the scripts and broadcast them to Europe or South America. The radio is merely an instrumentality. The subject matter goes further than that; it goes to the question of policy.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to call the Senate's attention——

Mr. CONNALLY. Please read only part of that volume, not all of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, first session, March 26, 1947, at page 2590,

under the caption "Reference of Proposed Letter and Bill," I find this language:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has received—

Let us pay particular attention to this, please—

The Chair has received from the State Department a communication transmitting a draft of a bill to promote development of international radio broadcasting, to create an International Broadcasting Foundation, and for other purposes.

This is one of those situations, under the language of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, where a choice of committee references is clearly possible within the mandate of the reorganization law; but it seems in this instance the reference could be either to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Inasmuch as the bill had to do primarily with the creation of a domestic corporation dealing with the subject of radio broadcasting internationally, it seems to the Chair that the radio phase overrides whatever the international character of broadcasting involves. Therefore, without objection, and unless there is an appeal to the contrary, the Chair will refer this communication and proposed legislation to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There was no appeal from the decision of the Chair. In respect to that bill there was a situation similar to that which we are discussing at the moment, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question as between the other two committees can be settled after the Senate acts on the pending appeal from the decision of the Chair.

What the Senator was reading about the radio arrangements with foreign countries related to the private operation of international means of communication.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I again say that the State Department is taking the position that they contracted for this work with the broadcasting companies and that they have no responsibility concerning it. If that be true, then it is a domestic affair.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is the attitude of the State Department, the State Department is wrong. If I have an option to do or not to do something, and I make a contract with some one else to do it, he is doing it for me, and I am responsible. The State Department cannot wash its hands of responsibility.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 1,000 percent with the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will continue to agree with me 1,000 percent.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Texas in the position he has so well expressed and taken here today. He takes the position, as I understand, that the resolution is a matter which properly goes to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. While I appreciate that the immediate question before the Senate, as I understand, is an appeal from a decision by the Chair that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senator from Texas taking the view that it should have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think it is appropriate to point out two matters in support of the views expressed by the Senator from Texas.

First, the language of Public Law 601, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, with relation to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, says that to that committee shall be referred—

all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to * * *. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that clearly the subject matter under discussion is one involving "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally."

As regards the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the subject matter to which the Senator from Maine has referred is "Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television." As I see it, that is not the subject matter that is being discussed now. We have here a question—and I am interpolating a quotation—involving "subject matter transmitted" through "communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television."

Mr. President, that is not a subject which is confided by the Reorganization Act to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Reorganization Act, as I understand, confides to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the subject of communication—that is to say, the physical or technical or scientific means of communication—by telephone and telegraph, and not the subject matter transmitted thereby. To my mind the subject matter that is transmitted under the series of circumstances which we now have before us is a subject matter relating peculiarly and distinctively to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

So, Mr. President, I take pleasure in associating myself, through the courtesy of the Senator from Texas at this time, with the position which he takes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Briefly.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Missouri takes the position that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. May I ask the Senator from Missouri, what is broadcasting?

Mr. DONNELL. I think broadcasting is the transmission of whatever goes out over the broadcast—music, or information, or whatever it may be. But I still think that the subject matter that is by the Reorganization Act confided to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is not the subject matter transmitted through the telephone, telegraph, radio, and television, but it is merely—and I quote again from the act, "communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television." The subject matter which was transmitted is what is here important, not whether it went out through the proper antenna or was received by the proper antenna. The subject matter is that which is distinctly included within the term "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally." So, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained, and I trust that in due time it may be proper for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for his very clear and strong statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose, instead of the information going out over the radio, under the sponsorship of the State Department, it had gone through the mail?

Mr. CONNALLY. Through the post office.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose it had been a letter sent by the State Department to our foreign representatives, to be broadcast over the world, with regard to the policy of the United States in international affairs? Certainly no one would contend that under those conditions a resolution of this sort ought to go to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The mail would be the mere mechanical agency of transmission of the policy of the State Department, through the Post Office, to foreign countries.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Texas. I expressed myself in that regard a moment ago. Suppose that out of the proposed investigation should come the necessity for legislation amending the law in regard to the Voice of America? Where would that legislation go? It would go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have no jurisdiction over legislation dealing with our foreign policy. So that we would have an investigation going on by one committee, and if it resulted in legislation, the legislation would have to come from another committee, which had not participated in the investigation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me proceed for a little while. What was the original concept of the Voice of America? What was it for? Was it to determine how many frequencies should go out over the radio? Was there any concept of the kilocycles, or any of the other of the technical things which relate to radio, which should be investigated by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? Of course not. The question was one of foreign policy, not

having to do with the mechanical details of the instrumentalities of transmission. The objective was to transmit to foreign countries the views of the United States on international relations, information regarding our form of government, information regarding democracy and parliamentary government.

Mr. President, what was the motive behind it? The motive was to affect and influence our international relations. Was not that the purpose? Why did we spend the appropriations? If that was not the purpose, let us cut it all out and let it go. Of course the purpose was to improve our foreign relations, to influence and improve the attitude of European nations toward the United States and our policies. Yet we are told now that because we find fault with this organization and want to give it attention, and want to correct its errors, we must go to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. We are told that the question must be asked: "How much money did you spend? We do not care anything about what you said to Europe. That is not important. We do not care anything about the policies you perverted and distorted into falsehood and libel, but we want to know how much money you spent." Mr. President, we already know that.

Then the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce comes along and says, "We are not concerned with what you send out over the airwaves, but we want to know exactly how many pulsations of the ether you disturbed."

Mr. President, I have high regard for the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has rendered a wonderful service in that committee. He has secured practical unanimity on substantially all big problems. I am sorry to see the chairman in his dual capacity: "Here I am over here as chairman of the committee, and here I am over here as Presiding Officer of the Senate. Now what shall I do? Oh, if only one of the dear charmers were away!"

No, Mr. President, the resolution should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I understand the present attitude of the Chair, if the appeal is sustained, then he will reconsider the matter and decide as between the two committees. So I urge the Senate to sustain the appeal from the decision of the Chair and let us go into this matter in a proper and better way. If we go into it, we shall probably have to hear some technical discussions by the Senator from Indiana and others as to what wavelengths should be used in transmitting the program and how many frequencies should be required. But, Mr. President, those are not the questions involved. The real questions are the peace of the world, the proper relationship of this Government to other countries, the proper understanding on the part of other governments and other peoples respecting the attitude of the United States. Who are the authorities that distort the information at the source by weighing it down with falsehood, slander, libel, and all the vile insinuations contained in these broadcasts? Those are the questions involved.

Mr. President, I insist that the Chair is in error, and that the matter ought to be reconsidered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think we have had a great deal of discussion today which may or may not prove to be pertinent to the situation. It is my opinion that unless it is the desire of the Senate to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a special investigation of the affair no resolution is necessary. Certainly, as I read the Reorganization Act, no resolution is necessary, in my opinion, to authorize the Committee on Foreign Relations to investigate a matter of this nature. It is possible that a resolution might be necessary to give it sufficient funds with which to conduct that investigation. But I believe there can be no question as to the authority of the Foreign Relations Committee to conduct an investigation or make a study of any matter which comes up or anything which occurs under that department of Government over which the committee has legislative jurisdiction.

By the same token, I can see no reason why the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee could have any claim whatsoever to an investigation of this kind unless it is clearly the desire of the Senate that that committee be given the authority to make the investigation. Certainly the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee does not supervise the affairs of the State Department. If this thing had been done by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or the Federal Communications Commission, or the Department of Commerce, then it would clearly have fallen within the right of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to make an investigation, although in that case the committee might have been obliged to ask for an appropriation to carry on the investigation.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to conclude my statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish the Senator would yield on the point he has just mentioned.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well, I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. If it should be found that the National Broadcasting Co. were primarily responsible for this affair, their entire procedures and the character of their programs would fall within the purview of the Federal Communications Commission, and therefore the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would have the right to study broadcasting procedures. But in this particular instance, Mr. President, the National Broadcasting Co. at most was acting as a paid agent for the State Department. It was money appropriated to the State Department that was being spent. Therefore I do not believe that in this instance the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would hold any jurisdiction whatsoever in regard to investigating the manner in which the State Department spent its money.

The law clearly authorizes the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make investigations of any agencies of Government at all levels. I shall read the language of the law. In the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 it is provided that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall have the duty of—

> (B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Mr. President, several million dollars were appropriated to the State Department to promote good will for America and to promote an understanding of America throughout the world. It appears from what developed yesterday that a part of that money at least has been spent in sabotaging the reputation of the United States in foreign countries. Certainly that could not be called spending money economically or efficiently from the point of view of a citizen of the United States or from the point of view of Congress.

I can well understand the apprehension of the National Broadcasting Co. over an investigation of this kind. I can well understand the apprehension which might prevail in the State Department over an investigation of this kind. I have no doubt that the officials of the National Broadcasting Co. did not have the slightest idea of the kind of trash that was being sent out over their system. They probably could not have understood the language had they been listening in. I presume they were unaware of it, although that will develop later.

Certainly the higher officials of the State Department could not have read and approved these scripts which were broadcast. Nevertheless, they are, of course, responsible for the work of those who hold office under them.

Yesterday when this matter came up it seemed to me to be one of the most serious developments that has occurred in this country for a long time, in that an agency of government had permitted material to be broadcast to the world which was damaging to the United States. I lost no time in discussing the matter with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who, as everyone knows, is chairman of the Subcommittee on Expenditures which pays particular attention to "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

I suppose the Senate can proceed and act on the pending resolution if it likes, but I feel that it is my duty to tell the Senate that an investigation is already under way by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, through the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. We have the authority to conduct it, we have the money with which to conduct it, and I will say that it will take formal action to prevent the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive

Departments from carrying out its duties as prescribed by law.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield to the Senator from Michigan as I think he has a further statement to make at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Vermont can farm out the time on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. I know that he did not intend to farm out the time on the floor of the Senate, but I have been seeking recognition for some time merely to make a few observations concerning what I conceive to be the fundamental question involved here. It has been touched upon by the Senator from Texas and other Senators, but I think it cannot be too often emphasized. The question involved is not one of mechanical transmission of radio broadcasts, over which subject the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction. It is a question of fundamental, basic policies which affect the relations of this Nation with other nations of the world. That is all that is involved. Unless those policies are involved in these international broadcasts, there is no authority and no reason whatsoever for continuing them.

I recall quite well that in the testimony before our committee Secretary of State Marshall said that he considered this program one of the vital arms of the State Department. It is a part of the diplomatic procedures and methods of this Government. It is not a part of radio communication as such. Its only justification is that it seeks to improve our relations with other nations of the world.

In addition to what has been said about the Reorganization Act conferring general jurisdiction upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, the language of the act being "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally," it is also specifically provided in the Reorganization Act that all measures relating to the diplomatic service shall come under the jurisdiction of that committee. If this measure does not relate to the diplomatic service, it relates to nothing; it has no place or part in our legislative functions whatever, and the whole program should be discontinued. It is a part of the diplomatic service, a part of the State Department. That is the basis for the entire program.

Mr. President, I submitted the original resolution providing for an investigation of the Voice of America. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations without objection. It was considered by that committee and later included in other legislation. That proposal was agreed to; and there was authorized by the Congress a joint investigation by a committee consisting of members appointed from the membership of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Our committee was headed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The committee which conducted the investigation was not a joint committee. The committee of each House designated certain members of a separate committee, but a joint investigation was conducted.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has already assumed jurisdiction of this subject under the Reorganization Act. It has appointed a subcommittee of that committee, and the subcommittee has made its investigation. I am not at all sure that the power of the subcommittee has expired. If I recall correctly, it was appointed for this Congress, and I do not recall that any order has ever been made discharging the subcommittee, although it may have been.

Mr. FERGUSON. What subcommittee was that?

Mr. HATCH. It was a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was chairman of it. The Senator from New Jersey rose and modestly and generously said that he did not want to investigate himself and his own committee. I admire the modesty of the Senator from New Jersey, just as I admire the modesty of the President pro tempore, but I feel that both of them have fallen into error. They have fallen into the same error into which presiding officers, judges, and others fall when they are called upon to rule upon some question with respect to which there may be a special interest. They are inclined to lean over backward. I think that is exactly what the President pro tempore has done in making the ruling in this instance. I admire him for the disposition which he has manifested, but I believe that he leaned over backward, in detriment to his own committee. I believe that the Senator from New Jersey is guilty of the same error. He leaned over backward because he thought he might be placed in the position of seeking to prevent an investigation of the work which he so capably and efficiently carried on, with credit to himself, the subcommittee, the full committee, and the United States Senate.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the point made by the Senator, but it really does not involve an investigation of the work of the Senator from New Jersey in the committee or the work of the committee.

Mr. HATCH. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. It involves the manner in which the State Department is carrying on the work laid down for it by the committee and by the Congress.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is entirely correct, and I agree with him. But it was the fear of the Senator from New Jersey that he might be in the position of seeking to interfere with an investigation of his committee. It is not an investigation of his committee at all. If it were an investigation of his committee, I would certainly oppose any such investigation.

In view of what was developed here yesterday, I believe that further study of the Voice of America and how it is operating under the legislation enacted by Congress, which legislation was considered and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, should be made. Furthermore, I believe that under the Reorganization Act, that paragraph which was read by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and I think referred to by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] we not only have authority in that committee to study and investigate how this legislation is being administered by the State Department, but we have a high and solemn obligation to perform that duty. We do not need a resolution. We do not need additional authority to conduct such an investigation. Authority is already vested in the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Reorganization Act; and any move to transfer such authority to another committee is a move to divest the Committee on Foreign Relations of the duty and responsibility imposed upon it by law. Neither the Senator from New Jersey, with all his modesty, nor the President pro tempore, leaning over backward, has any right to shirk and avoid the responsibility which is placed upon us by the Reorganization Act. Certainly the United States Senate has no right to take from the Foreign Relations Committee the duty which the Congress has placed upon it.

Mr. President, by every consideration this resolution belongs with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and with no other committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to see that all Senators who have thus far spoken have agreed that there should be an investigation. It is refreshing to have Senators agree that at least an investigation should be made.

The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has undertaken to organize a staff so that the committee may take on the burden of investigations for the Senate. If the committee does not have jurisdiction in this case, I know of no case concerning any department of Government in which it would have jurisdiction. As I read the duties of the various committees, I note that their jurisdiction covers particular branches or departments of Government. The Foreign Relations Committee deals with the State Department and with questions affecting foreign relations; the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the Labor Department and subjects affecting labor; the Armed Services Committee with the Army and Navy, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the subject of commerce. Every one of the agencies of Government is thoroughly covered, and under the theory which has been advanced there would be no jurisdiction for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

As I remember the debates at the time when the Reorganization Act was under consideration, it was thought that the operations and activities of the Government should be studied at all levels, to determine their economy and efficiency. If there is anything which involves the efficiency of the Government, it is the broadcasting of these programs to South

America. The efficiency of the State Department, the Department which was responsible for the broadcasts, is certainly in question. There is to be an investigation. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is not going to attempt to investigate cases which other committees have a right to investigate without separate investigatory authority. Without the adoption of such a resolution, the Foreign Relations Committee can go into the question of how the broadcast affected South America. But already, yesterday, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments called together the committee, and last evening we proceeded to call witnesses, in order that we may determine how such a blunder could be made and how the efficiency could be so low that such broadcasts could have been made by an agency of this great Nation, regardless of what was affected.

So already this morning the staff of the committee has undertaken to go into the question of the efficiency of this activity of the Government in connection with the broadcasting companies. I know of nothing that would prevent the Foreign Relations Committee from going into the questions that are involved, but I know of no reason why the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should not continue the investigation it already has started.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of the committee, for taking such action. I think they are to be commended for doing so.

In view of the fact that the Senator is now maintaining that his committee is so efficient, I should like to ask why something was not done about this matter weeks ago. An article about one of the broadcasts made by the Voice of America was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some weeks ago, in fact, under date of March 4, 1948. That broadcast was just about as silly and asinine as the ones I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 26, 1948.

Again I wish to congratulate the Senators, but I do not wish to have the Senate receive the impression that their committee is the only one that is qualified and is on the job and is efficient enough to handle this matter.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Indiana what difference it makes whether these broadcasts cost $1 or $10 or $5, so far as the actual expenditures are concerned. That is not the question at all. The question is how our foreign relations have been affected by these slanders and libels.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said yesterday that today I would submit a resolution calling for an investigation of this matter. Yesterday we talked at great length on the floor of the Senate about the broadcasts. I said no less than half a dozen times that I would submit a resolution calling for an investigation. I believe I was solicited to do so by the Senator from Texas.

But before we could submit the resolution, and before the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday's proceedings was printed, and almost before anyone could even turn around, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments proceeded to begin its investigation. I congratulate the committee. My only regret is that it did not do so 30, 60, or 90 days ago.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Indiana said that he stated half a dozen times yesterday that he would submit a resolution calling for an investigation of this matter. I should like to inform him, and the Senate as a whole, that the investigation was under way before the Senator from Indiana made that statement the first time. So far as I am concerned, he had not made the statement at all before I was discussing with the Senator from Michigan what we were going to do about the matter, and the Senator from Michigan was on the telephone directing the investigation to begin.

Furthermore, I am sure that had the committee known about this matter a month ago, the investigation would have started a month ago. If the Senator from Indiana had the information a month before the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments had it, it was his duty, it seems to me, to make the information public at that time, instead of waiting until this time. He had the same access to the press and to the radio that other Members of the Senate had.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presented the matter to the Senate at the earliest possible moment after the material was placed in my hands; and I am happy that I did so, because at least we are getting to the bottom of what I consider a dirty situation.

I regret exceedingly that there should be any argument today in regard to what committee has jurisdiction. This matter should be handled promptly by the United States Senate. The people who are responsible in this situation should be brought before a committee of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Indiana necessarily precipitated the controversy by writing into his resolution a request that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—even attempting to take away from the Chair the right to decide the question of which committee should have jurisdiction. There is no way to avoid such a controversy when the Senator takes the attitude of writing into his resolution the name of the committee to which it should be referred.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I believe it was stated to the press that the resolution would be referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, before I even made the statement or submitted the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know who was responsible for that.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator's statement was slightly inaccurate. The resolution proposes that the investigation shall be conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the Senator from Indiana is a member. But I point out that that by no means concludes the question of reference, for regardless of whether it is decided that the resolution should be referred to A committee or B committee or C committee—to the Foreign Relations Committee or to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the only question is whether there should be an investigation, and whether the resolution proposing that an investigation be made should be adopted.

The question before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will not be whether it will make an investigation. It will be whether the Senate will authorize and direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make such an investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was merely replying to the Senator from Indiana, who had deplored the fact that we have gotten into a controversy over the question of the reference of the resolution. I pointed out that such a controversy could not be avoided when the Senator from Indiana wrote into the resolution the name of the committee which should make the investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Indiana did not write into the resolution the name of the committee which should make the investigation. He wrote into the resolution the name of the committee to which the resolution should be referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. But surely the Senator from Maine would not expect the resolution to be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and then have the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce make the investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think much good may come out of this discussion, which may seem to have taken a great deal of the time of the Senate at a very congested period. Yet, the fundamental question here is one which ultimately must be resolved. There is no question that under the phraseology of the Reorganization Act and under one theory of its approach there is not a single subject which is not within the purview and jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the

Executive Departments. That point has been repeatedly made.

On the other hand, there are other standing committees which cover the whole field of governmental activities; and they, too, have a responsibility under section 136 of the act to make such investigations.

I have had repeated discussions about this matter with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] during the last few months, as we have been associated in investigation activities, and have pointed out that ultimately, by a process of comity, this question must be resolved.

I wish to point out that when this matter was presented this morning by the Senator from Indiana, and when he proposed that an investigation should proceed, it was immediately pointed out by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, who also is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the investigation was fully within the scope of the jurisdiction of various committees, but that in the interest of comity he should take up the matter with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I added the suggestion that we discuss it with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which appropriated the money for the program, and also with the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, in order that by the gentle process of discussion we should resolve the question of how this matter could best be handled. Before we finish with the subject of reorganization, the basic principle behind this question must be determined.

The question is not whether one or another committee has jurisdiction, but how the matter may be most effectively and most appropriately handled. I do not think it can be questioned that some aspects of this matter are within the purview of many committees. However, I point out that while we are debating this question, the House committee is now making an investigation of this matter, and it has already called witnesses.

I think it is unfortunate that quite such precipitate action was taken after the Senator from Indiana yesterday indicated that he proposed to present a resolution dealing with this matter. I think a certain amount of senatorial consideration might have caused Senators to await his action before proceeding. In that respect, I think this situation is unfortunate.

I certainly would not wish today to have a vote overruling the decision of the Chair establish a precedent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], or its subcommittee headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], should be ousted of all responsibility which was bestowed upon that committee, not only by the Reorganization Act, but by the appropriation of $200,000 for that purpose. I share the deep sympathy regarding the difficulty of deciding the matter, but I do not think the investigation should be delayed because of such considerations. I think we must develop some method of comity by which situations such as the present one shall be handled.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say for whatever it may be worth that I do not think the vote on the appeal from the decision of the Chair in regard to reference of the resolution would have the slightest effect upon the jurisdiction generally of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Michigan is chairman. They have authority under the law. They could go ahead and investigate the economical or efficient expenditure of money in any department. That is the purpose for which the committee was created.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, if its attention had been called to this particular situation, could, without a resolution, have gone on with the investigation, and, no doubt, would have done so. But here the Senator from Indiana, after bringing the matter yesterday to the attention of the Senate and announcing he would offer a resolution today, submits a resolution which, after one or two whereases, says:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby gives unanimous approval—

The Senator is a little off, there—

to a full and complete investigation of these agencies by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate.

It seems to me that, regardless of the vote upon the appeal from the decision of the Chair, whether it is sustained or overruled, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and any subcommittee authorized by it would continue to have such jurisdiction hereafter to go on with its investigations as it had heretofore. I am quite certain no possible effect can be had upon that committee and its jurisdiction, whatever happens to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think we now know what the issues are, and in all fairness to the Senate, in view of our heavy schedule, why do we not proceed to vote?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after the Senator from Indiana has taken so much time, and the Senator from Michigan has farmed out so much time, I should like to have the opportunity of saying a few words on this subject myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to state for the information of the Senate, so it may be on notice, that a call for the regular order will again bring the displaced persons bill, S. 2242, to the attention of the Senate.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to say to the Senator from Kentucky, I am sure he will recognize the very great desirability of our developing some method by which further discussions of this character in other situations which may arise shall be conducted, and that there shall be worked out some procedure, informal or otherwise, by which so far as possible difficulties of this character shall be avoided in the future.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, absolutely; I agree to that. It is unfortunate we have to get into a debate over a question of the jurisdiction of committees. But I was never more sincere in my life than I am in the assertion that the proposition, which is purely a parliamentary matter, as to which committee shall receive the resolution, in no way impinges upon or will impinge upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to investigate any department it sees fit to investigate.

Mr. BREWSTER. There can be no doubt of that.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, in the event the decision of the Chair is overruled, whether the Senator from Kentucky would consider that it could in any way be construed as an admonition to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to soft pedal the investigation which it already has under way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all—or any other investigation it might make.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I felt certain that would be the Senator's position.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be so construed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wanted it made clear, so that no one would understand that the vote on the appeal, regardless of its result, would affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make full and complete investigations as to the manner in which money is spent by any Government department as written in the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think, by any stretch of the imagination, an adverse vote on the ruling of the Chair today would affect the jurisdiction of the committee of which the Senator from Vermont is chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall decline to yield further for a few moments, in order that I may say something on the pending question. I know that the Senate is interested in economy; at least, at times a slight indication is shown of a desire to economize. In the present instance the issue boils down to the question whether after the Senate has created a committee, staffed the committee, and appropriated money for the committee to carry on investigative work, to ascertain certain facts, when a resolution comes before the Senate asking for an investigation of facts, some other committee shall be authorized to do the work, and a new appropriation shall be made. That is exactly what we have before us today. The resolution concludes by saying:

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcom-

mittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Apparently the purpose is that the agencies shall investigate themselves. That is not the manner in which the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments works.

Reading further, the resolution provides:

The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be given immediate consideration by the Senate when so requested by said committee in an amount sufficient to carry out the purpose of this resolution, which expenses shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

So in the final analysis the question is whether, as suggested by the able Senator from Kentucky, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall continue and shall have full authority to continue, the investigation, or whether there shall be erected a new committee, for which new funds will be appropriated, to follow and go over the same grounds as those the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has begun to go over. That is the question before the Senate.

I think the able Senator who occupies the chair has made a reference to the proper committee which will promote uniformity and efficiency in the investigation, as well as economy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 39, answered "present" 1, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aiken	Ecton	Martin
Bricker	Ferguson	Millikin
Bridges	Flanders	Morse
Buck	George	O'Conor
Butler	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Taft
Capper	Kem	Thye
Cooper	Knowland	Wilson
Cordon	Lodge	Young
Dworshak	McCarthy	
Eastland	Malone	

NAYS—39

Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	McClellan	Sparkman
Donnell	McFarland	Stennis
Downey	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Feazel	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Hatch	Murray	Williams

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—22

Baldwin	Lucas	Taylor
Ball	McCarran	Tobey
Bushfield	Magnuson	Umstead
Hawkes	Myers	Wagner
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Watkins
Hoey	Reed	Wiley
Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.	
Langer	Stewart	

So the Senate refused to sustain the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair makes a further reference of the resolution to the Committee of Foreign Relations, which action is again subject to appeal if any Senator desires to appeal.

There being no appeal, the resolution is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement, if I may, on the matter which has just been under discussion in the Senate.

Yesterday during the debate of the Voice of America program and the suggestions made by the Senator from Indiana, I stated that I had gotten in touch with Assistant Secretary of State George B. Allen and asked him if he would submit to me a statement, if he had any to make, which I might incorporate in the RECORD for the State Department. I have received a letter from Mr. Allen, dated May 27, which I should like to read into the RECORD. There is an exhibit attached, and I ask unanimous consent that the exhibit may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am sure this letter will be of interest to all my colleagues as it states the present position of the State Department in the matter under consideration, and will have a bearing on the investigation which I believe will presently be made by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Secretary Allen writes as follows:

MAY 27, 1948.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Yesterday you requested me to give you information concerning scripts from the Know North America series broadcast during the past winter, under the Voice of America program.

I attach a memorandum which gives the background concerning these scripts and the contractual relationship between the Department of State and the National Broadcasting Co., by which the scripts were prepared. The scripts were broadcast in Spanish, beamed to Latin America, and were identified as presentations of NBC.

Note the next statement:

No mention of the Voice of America was made, I am glad to say, in the broadcasts.

I understood, from what the Senator from Indiana stated, that the Voice of America was referred to in the broadcast. Continuing, Secretary Allen says:

These scripts are as disappointing to me as I am certain they must be to the National Broadcasting Co. Since assuming my duties on March 31 of this year, I have gone into the existing contracts with private agencies with the determination to avoid if humanly possible any repetition of this sort of thing. We are in the process at this moment of negotiating new contracts with private agencies for the coming fiscal year which will provide adequate machinery for supervision by departmental personnel of all programs prior to their being broadcast. The question immediately arises, "Why was this not done before?"

I wish to invite your attention to the circumstances under which the existing contracts were executed last year.

The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee last spring contains the following language: "The committee is of the opinion that shortwave broadcasting can be handled more effectively and efficiently by private broadcasters. The limitation (in the appropriation for personal services in the International Broadcasting Division of the State Department) is designed to limit the number of employees in this Division so as to require the State Department to contract with private broadcasters for shortwave programing."

In the debate in the Senate, it was also made clear that the intent of Congress was that just as much of the broadcasting program as possible should be turned over to private broadcasters and that the latter should do the actual preparation of the script.

The whole intent of the committee report and the debate was that private broadcasters could do the job more effectively than the State Department and that the job should be left to them to the maximum possible extent.

While I had no personal connection with the negotiation of the existing contracts, I must say in all honesty, after examining the record, that they seem to me to have been drawn up in an effort to execute as faithfully as possible the clear intent of Congress.

I might interpolate here, Mr. President, that I am not personally agreeing with Mr. Allen on that point, and in reading the letter I am reading it to present his point of view, and not my own point of view. I continue reading from the letter:

Three categories of programs were adopted. The first and most important category was

news broadcasts. For eastern Europe and the critical areas, the State Department undertook to do all of this broadcasting itself, and the private agencies were quite content to allow the Department to do it, for the responsibility in this field was greater than any private agency wished to assume. For other areas, the State Department maintained close supervision over news broadcasts by private agencies.

I am glad to note that these broadcasts did not go to the European theater. The State Department did keep its supervision in that area. The letter continues:

The second category, covering editorial and news analysis, is handled in the same way.

The third category, that of features and entertainment, was left almost entirely to the private agencies, since it was in this field that the private agencies were most experienced and could presumably do the most effective job. It was in this category that the scripts under discussion were prepared. These 15-minute programs were broadcast once a week and constituted an infinitesimal portion of the weekly total of 231 hours of programs in all languages carried under the total Voice of America program.

During the Senate debate of yesterday, the question of loyalty and security investigations of personnel engaged in broadcasting was raised by several Senators.

I am glad to call the attention of the Senate to this statement:

As an invariable practice, all personnel employed by the Department in the information and educational exchange programs are subjected to a departmental security check. Under the requirements of Public Law 402, all personnel employed or assigned to this program must be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation prior to July 27, 1948. Such FBI investigations are now under way and many have been completed already. The question of security investigations on personnel employed by NBC under the shortwave-programing contract has been the subject of conferences with company representatives and the Department has been informed that NBC has secured reports on their personnel from the FBI.

I should point out that the record shows that at the time the appropriation was voted last year, the State Department made the statement that in its opinion the responsibility of the Secretary of State, accompanied by such extensive subcontracting arrangements as required by Congress, would create difficulties. However, the Department tried as honestly as it could to carry out the congressional directive, and supervision over this type of program was limited to general directives in accordance with the expressed belief that the private agencies could do a more effective job in this field.

We all learn by experience. Based on the views which have been expressed by Members of Congress during the hearings on the 1949 appropriations bill, it now seems clear that Members of Congress themselves have doubts regarding the view expressed last year.

It is abundantly clear that the existing type of contract is not satisfactory and new contracts are at present being drawn which will enable the Department to supervise the programs and carry out its responsibilities. It is clear from experience that if the Department is to be held responsible for the content of this type of program, the Department must have the authority and machinery for supervision. I believe the present debate has been salutary and I welcome any investigation of the operation so that all concerned will have a clearer understanding of the intent of Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, I read this letter because I stated yesterday that I would ask Mr. Allen for a statement. I place it in the RECORD so it may form a part of the record of the entire matter, not with an expression of opinion on my part as to its soundness or unsoundness, but in order to do justice to Mr. Allen, who should be permitted at this point to have his letter, together with the enclosures, placed in the RECORD as part of the discussion of this important subject.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to delay matters but I should like to call attention again to that part of the letter in which Mr. Allen makes abundantly clear that if the State Department is to be charged with responsibility it must have authority to and must supervise the programs.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is entirely correct, and that is one of the points I hope will be thoroughly investigated in the hearings and in the examinations respecting this matter, which now apparently will be made through the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, as the Senator well knows, one of the chief fears which has been expressed in that regard is that we would get into the field of censorship, which is something we all want to avoid. But this matter is purely, as has been said in the debate, a case of a diplomatic function of government. It is not a question of censorship of news agencies or broadcasting stations. If the State Department is to have charge of our diplomatic relations—and of course it does have charge of them—it must be responsible for all these activities and must have the necessary authority to carry them out.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I should like to add that Mr. Allen has been active as the head of this agency only since about the first of April. I have had several conversations with him. He has worked diligently to have his advisory committee organized in order to work out the program with entirely new forms of contracts which will certainly protect the people of the United States and the Government of the United States against such outrageous broadcasts as have been called to our attention. I am confident that the program can be worked out under the right policy and with the right support, and I know all Senators will be behind Assistant Secretary Allen in what he does in this respect.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am compelled to leave the floor, but before leaving and before the discussion of the subject is concluded, I will say that I had understood that there is some feeling that the vote just taken expressed some lack of confidence in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I want to refute as strongly as possible any such idea or belief. In the vote which was cast and the arguments which were made, there was expressed by no Senator any lack of confidence in that committee or in any member thereof. I merely want to make that statement for the RECORD, lest there might be a misinterpretation of the vote of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. In that connection, Mr. President, I may say it was my understanding that however the vote went, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments still has the responsibility, from the standpoint of expenditures, of investigating the matter, and I understand they are proposing to go ahead with that investigation. I sincerely hope they will do so from the standpoint of expenditures.

EXHIBIT A

"KNOW NORTH AMERICA" BROADCASTS

These broadcasts, prepared by the staff of the National Broadcasting Co., were discontinued on March 25, 1948. Until that date, the programs were broadcast as one of the weekly background shows in the Spanish-language service to Latin America. These 15-minute programs were broadcast once a week, and constituted an infinitesimal portion of the weekly total output of 231 hours of programs in all languages carried over the Voice of America. The programs were prepared by NBC under a general program contract between the Department of State and the network. A similar program contract exists between the Department and the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The scripts, all of which were broadcast last winter, were written by Rene Borgia, then a staff employee of the National Broadcasting Co., who worked under the immediate supervision of Abberto Gandero, regional supervisor, Spanish section, NBC. A biographical sketch on Mr. Borgia is attached. Neither Borgia nor Gandero is presently employed by NBC.

At present, NBC and CBS do 70 percent of all Voice of America broadcasts; the remaining 30 percent is done by the Department itself. The 30 percent of the total programing done by the Department is limited to what in June 1947 was believed to be the critical world areas—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and eastern Europe, part of the German and Austrian programs, and, in the Far East, China, and Korea. This is a result of limitations imposed by the fiscal 1948 appropriations legislation. These limitations are summarized concisely in the report on the bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The report contains the following language: "The committee is of the opinion that shortwave broadcasting can be handled more effectively and efficiently by private broadcasters." The limitation (in the appropriation for personal services in the International Broadcasting Division of the State Department) is designed to limit the number of employees in this division so as to require the State Department to contract with private broadcasters for shortwave programing." Under these directives, 70 percent of all broadcasting and all programs to Latin America are done by the two networks.

The International Broadcasting Division of the Department, which does the programing to the critical areas, uses only an insignificant proportion of its programing for background, music or entertainment shows (2 percent), concentrating instead on news and editorial and information programs. CBS and NBC, on the other hand, include a much higher percentage of such programs, 30 percent and 42 percent, respectively, in their total air time. There are two major reasons for this arrangement of program time: (a) IBD broadcasts to areas where free access to objective news and information is absent, hence such material is featured; the networks, broadcasting to areas where news flows with much more freedom and in substantial volume, must maintain a more diversified type of program to attract an

audience; and (b) the networks have been deemed more competent in the entertainment type of program based on their long and extensive domestic broadcasting experience.

The Department's existing contracts with the networks are based solely on the authority contained in the 1948 appropriations legislation, since what is now Public Law 402 was still pending in the Senate at the time the old contracts expired. In negotiating the present contracts, the Department was guided also by the wording of the Senate report on the appropriations bill, the specific budgetary limitations contained therein (the Senate committee report imposed a ceiling of $100,000 for all supervision of broadcasts which included total administrative overhead for broadcasting, supervision of programs to the critical areas and for network programs) and the floor debate at the time the legislation was considered by the Senate.

During the House hearings on the first deficiency appropriation for 1948, which were held on March 10 and 11, 1948, there was a full review of the question of these broadcasts and the contractual relationships between the networks and the Department. Testimony given by a Department spokesman at those hearings (see Hearings, pp. 1071-1072, 1073) summarizes the broadcasting contract as follows:

"When the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported last spring on the appropriations relating to the information program, they said specifically in their report that they were setting a limitation on the funds available to the Department of State for salaries and expenses in the International Broadcasting Division. They said they would allow flexibility in other portions of the program, but they were setting a specific ceiling on the amount to be devoted to international broadcasts, and within that ceiling they were setting a lower ceiling which was to be used, and not to exceed that amount, for personal services in the International Broadcasting Division of the Department of State.

"The statement made in the committee report is as follows: 'The committee is of the opinion short-wave broadcasting can be handled more effectively and efficiently by private broadcasters. The limitation is designed to limit the number of employees in this Division so as to require the State Department to contract with private broadcasters for short-wave programing.' * * *

"In the debate in the Senate it was also clear in the discussions between, principally, Senator BALL and Senator SMITH that the intent was clear that just as much of this programing in the short-wave field as possible should be turned over by the Department of State to the private broadcasters. They made it quite clear that they hoped the Department of State would decide the general policy and the type of program that it wants; they made it equally clear that the intent, at least of the Senate committee, was that the contractor should do the actual preparation of the script and do the broadcasting itself. * * *

"It was clear from the debate in the Senate that the intent was that the Department of State should accept a general supervisory responsibility, but nowhere was it contemplated we should preview each and every word that went out on the air, and in the event that is the intent of Congress, we do not, frankly, have the set-up to do that at the present time. We do not have the manpower; we do not have the funds with which to do it. * * *

"The State Department, at the time this proposal (for turning over programing to the networks) was discussed, came forward and both informally and formally made a statement that in our opinion the delegation of the authority and the responsibility to the Secretary of State for this program accompanied by such extensive subcontracting arrangements, would create difficulties. Those difficulties have occurred.

"We said further, and we said this informally:

"'We have some hesitancy in determining whether we are actually going to be able to maintain the kind of control over the foreign-policy content of these programs that we believe a responsible public official needs to maintain.'

"We said, however, the need for international broadcasting is so great, the urgency of the situation is such, that we are perfectly happy to try and work the situation out. We have attempted to work the situation out, and, frankly, the cooperation with the private broadcasters has been better, I think, from our point of view than we had anticipated.

"The presidents of both the companies and their responsible officials in this area have told me also that the cooperation had worked out better than they had expected. They felt it had been reflected in the actual performance that we are getting."

As to the terms of the present contract, the following is a quotation from the contract with CBS which is now in effect. The contract with NBC is substantially the same:

"The Department shall provide the contractor with general directives for each program to be prepared, produced, presented, transmitted, or broadcast by the contractor hereunder, indicating the general character of the programs and designating whether dramatic, musical, news, and so forth, fixing the length of the programs, and the hour or hours, and the day or days. When such directives have been delivered to the contractor, the contractor subject to the limitations expressed herein, shall assume full responsibility for complying with them and shall exercise complete authority over such preparation, production, presentation, transmission, and broadcast within the framework of such directives."

There has never been any doubt in the Department of State, either in performance or in interpretation of responsibility, that the Department directs contractors as to the type of program to be broacast and supplies general and specific guidance governing the major programs. The Department within the existing budgeting limitations has been able to maintain a degree of precontrol and preediting of types of programs such as news, news analysis, commentary, and certain types of panel discussions, but this has not been true of feature or documentary programs or in the general field of entertainment.

During the Senate debate of yesterday, the question of loyalty and security investigations of personnel engaged in broadcasting was raised by several Senators. As an invariable practice all personnel employed by the Department in the information and educational exchange programs are subjected to a departmental security check. Under the requirements of Public Law 402, all personnel employed or assigned to this program must be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation prior to July 27, 1948. Such FBI investigations are now under way and many have been completed already. The question of security investigations on personnel employed by NBC under the short-wave programing contract has been the subject of conferences with company representatives and the Department has been informed that NBC has secured reports on their personnel from the FBI.

The Department has attempted to follow the wishes of Congress in the broadcasting field and also with respect to section 1005 of Public Law 402 (the Smith-Mundt Act), which reads:

"In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country."

It is clear both to the Department and to the networks that the present situation is unsatisfactory. A new approach to the problem is now under consideration by the Department. In essence, this plan calls for the establishment of a contractual relationship between the networks and ourselves, much as that of a sponsor to a network. It eliminates duplication of news desks and language desks, and provides for closer supervision and control of all output—the output of the networks as well as the output of our own desks. This is believed to be not only more efficient and less wasteful, but it provides for enlisting the services of the networks in the field in which they are most experienced, while leaving to the Department the political aspects of the problems, the responsibility for which the Department cannot turn over to others.

RENE BORGIA

(Material supplied by National Broadcasting Co.)

Rene Borgia, writer of the National Broadcasting Co. scripts in the series "Know the United States," is of Venezuelan origin.

He came to this country in 1939. He has taken out his first United States naturalization papers. He has held important positions in the foreign-language departments of Fox Pictures, and Warner Bros. in Los Angeles.

He has published, in Spanish, books of poems, plays, and political pamphlets of an anti-Communist nature. A sample of one of these pamphlets is in the files of the National Broadcasting Division, Department of State. It is entitled "Anti-Communist Manifesto," published in Venezuela in Spanish in 1938.

Borgia has been employed since only 1942 as writer, adaptor, translator on Spanish language programs to Latin American broadcast by NBC. Topmost rating has been accorded by Latin American radio stations and listeners to two of his efforts during these years. Both of these were for translating and adapting the highly successful NBC-International programs Radio Theater (radio dramatizations of American short stories, novels, drama), and Counter Spy (series dealing with dramatizations of FBI tracking down spies during the war).

Borgia resides in New York City, is married and has several children.

He has never been employed by the Department of State or any other agency of the Government. His efforts in international radio, as far as the Department knows, have been strictly as writer-translator on a free-lance basis for NBC.

Rene Borgia's work has been known to the Department since January 1946.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a very brief statement?

Mr. SMITH. I yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the concluding sentence of the remarks I made earlier today in connection with the Voice of America matter was:

So, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained, and I trust that in due time it may be proper for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I voted, however, in the negative on the question, which I think substantially was: Shall the decision of the Chair in referring the resolution to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments stand as the judgment of the Senate?

I desire to explain that in uttering that certain portion of my sentence which I have quoted, in which I said:

I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained.

I had overlooked the parliamentary situation which existed and under which it was necessary that, in order that it might be possible to bring about a later reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the question presented by the Chair be negatively decided. Mr. President, instead of saying "I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained," I should have said, "I respectfully submit that reference of the resolution to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be made."

Mr. President, the position which I favored and my advocacy of which I attempted to convey was that the committee to which the reference should be made is that on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to Mr. TABER, of the House of Representatives, by Rene Borgia, under date of March 1948, in which Mr. Borgia states that he wrote the Voice of America script on Wyoming, and that he prepared some 300 scripts for the State Department beginning shortly after Pearl Harbor.

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

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 1948.*

MY DEAR MR. TABER: I am the person who wrote that program on Wyoming. I don't blame you for not liking it. Of all concerned, I was the only one who protested, but I was ordered to write it that way. Whenever I said something about the series, the answer was always the same: "If you don't want to do it, we'll get someone else." I told the man in charge of the Spanish section that the program should be dignified, with some spontaneous humor, but not with artificial, silly jokes. They wanted neither history nor statistical facts, only light stuff to make people laugh. I explained to supervisors, producers, and directors that the programs were not in harmony with the policies of the State Department, and they told me I was working for a commercial enterprise and not for a Government agency, and that Congress itself had given them the program. What could I do? Resign? Yes, a few years ago I'd have thrown their instructions on their desks and leave, but now the only thing I have in the bank is children.

I was told not to worry, for the responsibility was theirs. And it is true, because after a program is broadcast, the writer's responsibility ends. If it was not right, why the supervisors, the producer, and the director okayed it? The reason is obvious. Mr. Richardson, the man in charge of the short-wave department, does not know a single word of any of the languages he is supposed to supervise. He had the innocence to tell me this: "I am now learning things which I should have investigated before." I told Mr. Sarnoff everything, but he didn't pay any attention to me. The company, to put an end to the situation—after you complained, of course—had a brilliant idea, they threw me out. The danger, sir, is still there, because the men who forced me to write that program are floating around the office, very much satisfied with themselves.

Two of my first programs, The Mississippi River and Texas, were written as I thought they should be, yet I was rebuked for not following instructions. I had worked for the State Department since Pearl Harbor, and wrote over 300 programs, the best ever broadcast in Spanish. But there we had story conferences, and every script was read and analyzed. Even editorials were written in Mexico and Argentine about my war programs. The State Department, I think, has a very good opinion of my work.

Please, sir, do not judge my mentality by that thing, which sounds worse in stiff, literal English. I am a real writer, a scholar, with a long experience as a dramatist and a political commentator. Besides, sir, the National Broadcasting Co. hired me as a translator, but 3 weeks later they made me write three original programs every week. I begged them to give me that series, Know the United States, in English, because I didn't want to write the programs as I was told, but they refused.

I am deeply sorry for having bothered you with that program, and with this uncalled for letter, but I must tell you the facts. NBC is to blame for what has happened, not I. They should have able men in that department, which not only represents the policies of the studio, but mainly, those of the American Government. A million thanks, sir.

Most respectfully yours,

RENE BORGIA.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter under date of May 17, 1948, from Rene Borgia addressed to Mr. Brown, on the same subject.

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

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 17, 1948.*

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: I thank you for your letter. I don't remember writing anything about your State, but NBC is now blaming me for all that happens there. I, like the Cid, am winning battles after death! That program, Know the United States, had been going on before I started working for that madhouse. You ask if that program was supervised. No program in the world is broadcast without being read, cut, and supervised by at least three persons, especially in big studios like NBC. A writer cannot do those things. They hire us to prepare the scripts and to be blamed after, if anything goes wrong. If the program is a success, it is not because of the script—the producer and supervisor claim all the glory.

As I say in my letters to Mr. TABER, Gandero, the man in charge of the Spanish section, told me to write those programs that way, and they gave me the material. I protested again and again, because I wanted to do something more dignified, but they wanted neither history nor statistics, just stuff to make people laugh. What could I do? Mr. Gandero and Vasquez, the producer, are not the only responsible ones. The head of the whole short-wave department approved those programs, otherwise Gandero and Vasquez wouldn't be able to produce them. Whenever I complained, telling them that thing was not what the State Department wanted, Gandero told me: "What do you care? They were approved by Richardson." This gentleman is always shut off in his office, with two beautiful dragons at its door, and an abstract "Thou shall not pass" in the atmosphere. I don't think this aloofness is aristocratic in origin, but to defend himself from those complicated languages of which he knows nothing. He perhaps thinks—"The less I am consulted, the less I'll err." Once, while revising something that I wrote, he asked Gandero if pandemia had anything to do with pan Americanism. Gandero hurried back to his desk, where I was waiting for him, to ask me—if it had. What culture.

Mr. Brown, a writer's responsibility ends when he delivers his script. You may write whatever you want, but it is up to the editor in Salt Lake City to approve it. Besides, I wrote as I was told. Radio producers and supervisors cut and add as they see fit—very seldom one does recognize his own offsprings. The Government pays plenty to the networks, yet NBC does not hire actors. Its announcers do the job. In CBS things are different—they produce the shows with real actors and the supervising is in the hands of two able men, Unanue and Perez. I never worked for the State Department, but Mr. Mucio Delgado, now in Washington, checked all the scripts I did for the National Broadcasting Co. For over 5 years my work was praised to the skies all over the Spanish-speaking world. The State Department does not have to be defended, much less by an insignificant person like I, but they are not to blame for what has happened in NBC. I have been told that Congress itself gave the programs to the networks. Mr. Brown, I had nothing at all to do with what those people did: I was never inside a stage in NBC. I delivered my work to Mr. Gandero, and from there on it was their funeral, I mean, mine. You, who are a writer, please don't blame me, too. Since Mr. TABER's complaint I am out of work. Up to then I was the best Spanish radio writer in New York, now I am nothing. NBC took me, raped me, and threw me out.

Always at your service, most respectfully yours,

RENE BORGIA.

P. S.—The name of the head of the short-wave department is Stanley Richardson.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 6659. This is the bill extending the Second War Powers Act, and it has an expiration time limit on it of May 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. President; I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agree-

ing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] adding a proviso on page 5, line 1.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Green	Moore
Barkley	Gurney	Morse
Brewster	Hatch	Murray
Bricker	Hawkes	O'Conor
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Buck	Hill	Reed
Butler	Holland	Revercomb
Byrd	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	White
Feazel	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Wilson
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
George	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in connection with the consideration of Senate bill 2242 a few days ago the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] raised some question about the citations contained in appendix 4 on page 80 of the printed report No. 950, dealing with homesteading and the use of public lands in continental United States and Alaska. I may say that the Senator from New Mexico reached the same conclusion as that reached in the report, but he raised some question as to the citation of authorities contained therein, and said that he felt the authorities were obsolete or not in point.

The law concerning homesteading and the use of public lands in continental United States and Alaska, as cited in the report of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization on Displaced Persons in Europe, has been rechecked by the committee staff and double-checked with counsel in the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, and we find that the citations contained in the report are correct. I feel that I should make this statement for the RECORD, so that no doubt will be cast upon the report or the citations contained in it.

What the Senator from New Mexico, Senator HATCH, probably had in mind the other day when he stated that the committee's citation was obsolete, was the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended.

No act has been passed repealing the homestead laws, except that the Taylor Grazing Act (48 Stat. 1269, 43 U. S. C. 315) has been held to have repealed the stock-raising homestead provisions of the act of December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 862, 43 U. S. C. 291), but did not repeal any other of the homestead laws. In view of the general order of withdrawal, Executive Order 6910 of November 26, 1934, and Executive Order 6964 of February 5, 1935, section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act was amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976, 43 U. S. C. 315f), to provide for the classification of those lands covered by the withdrawal orders or within grazing districts, which are more valuable or suitable for the production of agricultural crops than for the production of native grasses and forage plants, or more valuable or suitable for any other use than for the use provided for under the Taylor Grazing Act, and for the opening of such lands for entry, selection, or location in accordance with such classification under applicable public land laws. The Taylor Grazing Act and this classification procedure have no application to Alaska, the territory dealt with and spoken of in appendix 4.

During the course of checking this matter with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, this morning the committee staff was informed by the Bureau that during the last three fiscal years 213 applications for homesteading had been considered, 110 of which were approved, thus showing that the homestead laws are still in effect. There was a total of 1,723 classifications of public lands reviewed during the last three fiscal years, of which approximately 75 percent were approved.

I make this statement so as to keep the RECORD clear, and so as to sustain the accuracy of the statements contained in the report, under appendix 4 thereto.

Mr. President, the question now before the Senate is the amendment I have proposed, reading as follows:

On page 5, line 21, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add after the colon the following language: "*Provided, however*, That the wife, and unmarried dependent child under 21 years of age, of each of such persons may, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, be deemed to be of that class of persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits."

Mr. President, the amendment is offered to make certain that families will not be divided under the provision of the bill that 50 percent of those who are admitted must be persons who are engaged and have engaged and will be engaged in agricultural work.

My attention has been called to the use of the word "child" in the amendment. Although I feel that the use of that word in the singular number would embrace all of the class, yet in order to prevent any misunderstanding whatsoever from arising in regard to the meaning of the act, I now offer as a correction of my amendment the addition of the words "or children." I send to the desk at this time, Mr. President, the amendment with that correction stated therein, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5 in line 21, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add after the colon the following language: "*Provided, however*, That the wife, and unmarried dependent child or children under 21 years of age, of each of such persons may, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, be deemed to be of that class of persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I think the amendment is clear. I do not think there can be any doubt about it. I have heard of no opposition to it, and I am ready for the submission of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, so far as I personally am concerned, I have no objection to the modified amendment, and I know of no one who has any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that at this time the Senator from Michigan desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield the floor, so that the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I understand that the Revercomb amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And the Senator from Michigan is about to offer another amendment coming from members of the subcommittee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think at this time I should place in the RECORD a partial history of the displaced-persons legislation in the Senate.

PARTIAL HISTORY OF DP LEGISLATION IN SENATE

On July 2, 1947, the Senator from Michigan, on behalf of Mr. BALL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MORSE, and himself, introduced Senate bill 1563. The bill was essentially a statement of an intent that the United States should assume its fair share in the solution of the displaced-persons problem. It proposed to set up a program for the admission of displaced persons to the United States as nonquota immigrants for a 4-year period. It defined, in a broad scope, eligible displaced persons. It set up certain priorities for admissions. It did not attempt to fix a number which could be admitted in that 4-year period.

Mr. President, the reason for that was, it was thought at the time that the whole program should be examined, that the number of displaced persons should be ascertained, together with the number of persons we might be able to admit into this country, after which the bill could be used as a vehicle to carry the correct number.

The able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has related some of the further history of this displaced-persons

legislation. On July 26 Senate Resolution 137 was approved, authorizing the Judiciary Committee, or a subcommittee, to investigate the United States immigration system and the displaced-persons situation. The report on displaced persons was to be made by January 10, 1948. The reason for doing that was that the Senate was of the opinion it was an important problem, that time was of the essence, and that immediate action should be taken. The date, therefore, was fixed as of January 10, 1948. The date was extended to February 10, and later to March 1, by Senate Resolutions 178 and 193.

On March 1 a displaced-persons report was made to the Judiciary Committee by a special subcommittee whose studies had included on-the-spot investigations in Europe.

Mr. President, shortly after the close of the war in Europe the Senator from Michigan had an opportunity personally to visit certain of the displaced-persons camps in Europe. He is, therefore, somewhat familiar with the problem which presented itself in Europe in connection with the displaced-persons camps or settlements.

A proposed bill for the relief of displaced persons was included in the report filed by the subcommittee. As amended by the full committee, the bill was ordered to be introduced. It was reported on March 2. It is Senate bill 2242.

Mr. President, in the Judiciary Committee it was not unanimously believed that this was the bill which should be reported. There are, therefore, members of the Judiciary Committee, of which the Senator from Michigan is a member, who believe that a solution of the problems now facing not only the United States but the whole world, so far as displaced persons are concerned, will not be effected by Senate bill 2242. We have, I believe, certain fundamental differences in philosophy, by reason of which it is felt by some that the bill (S. 2242), now known as the committee bill, will not solve the problem. Those who believe it would not solve the problem felt so keenly about it that they were moved, because of their own philosophy, to propose from the floor amendments to the bill. That is my reason for appearing upon the floor today, as a cosponsor, with various amendments. Certain members of the Judiciary Committee and other Senators sincerely believe that, while Senate bill 2242 was a step in the direction of getting the matter to the floor, it was not the full step that is essential in order to solve the problem. That is the reason for offering certain amendments. There is a difference of opinion among Senators. Senators who brought forth the bill S. 2242 believe that the problem can be solved with that bill, but I think that, upon analyzing the bill and the various amendments, it will be found that something further is required, that certain amendments are necessary in order properly to solve the problem.

On April 1, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and himself, the Senator from Michigan introduced six amendments to the bill (S. 2242).

The first of the amendments substitutes the critical date of April 21, 1947, for the date December 22, 1945, in connection with the definition of "eligible displaced persons." The latter date bore an artificial significance.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. May I inquire which amendment is the Senator discussing at the present time?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall discuss them all briefly. The amendment I am now discussing increases the number of displaced persons who may be admitted to 200,000.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has the Senator called up his amendment? Is it the pending question?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I intend to call it up. I am referring to it now, and I shall call it up at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Am I correct in understanding that the first amendment which will be called up is the one dealing with the number of displaced persons to be admitted?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Michigan whether the amendment to which he is referring is the one dated April 1, 1948, lettered "E," which concerns itself with the number of displaced persons to be admitted, together with certain dates?

Mr. FERGUSON. It concerns itself with the number to be admitted. It is the amendment lettered "E." There are many amendments, and it required a moment or two to separate them and to ascertain the letter identifying the amendment now under discussion.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will yield, I believe he began to discuss the changing of the date.

Mr. FERGUSON. I had merely given the names of the sponsors.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the first amendment to be called up the one lettered "E?"

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. The date of December 22, 1945, bore artificial significance as the date of the Presidential directive making regular immigration quota numbers available to displaced persons. Among other reasons, we believe the date of April 21, 1947, to be more equitable and administratively more workable.

A second proposal, marked "B," would delete, on technical grounds, the part of the definition of eligible displaced persons which refers to a return to Germany or Austria "as a result of enemy action, or of war circumstances."

A third amendment, marked "F," would substitute the word "adequate" in deciding what kind of residence or living quarters they would have to have in this country, for the words "decent, safe, and sanitary."

Another amendment, marked "D," has as its purpose the establishing of a fair, adequate, and just basis for the selection of displaced-person immigrants. It provides for selection on the basis of a cross section of the groups and elements of displaced persons that existed in the camps on January 1, 1948.

To insure a more effective administration of the program, including selection, screening, transportation, and resettlement of DP's, another amendment, marked "C," proposes to broaden the authority of the special commission which is contemplated in the bill.

The number of displaced persons who may be admitted to the United States is a vital point in the legislation, as demonstrating our sincere intent to assume a fair share in the solution of the problem. The adoption of the amendment as against the limitation to 50,000 a year for 2 years, as provided in the committee bill, is essential to a solution, in cooperation with other nations. Its adoption is without prejudice to the employment or housing of United States citizens.

It is to this amendment that I wish to address myself at this time. Other Senators will address themselves to other amendments when they are brought to the floor.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 3, beginning with the word "fifty" in line 25, strike out down through and including line 6 on page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "two hundred thousand may be admitted into the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1949, and June 30, 1950, of which number not more than one hundred thousand may be admitted during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949."

In other words, no more than 100,000 could be admitted the first year, but if it were impossible to bring over 100,000 during the first year, then the number less than 100,000 could be added to the number to be admitted the second year, so that in the 2 years 200,000 could be brought into this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Chair to inquire whether the Senator from Michigan is desirous of offering the amendment at this time?

Mr. FERGUSON. I offer it at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate, and that will make the amendment the pending question.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, beginning with the word "fifty" in line 25, it is proposed to strike out down through and including line 6 on page 4, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Two hundred thousand may be admitted into the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1949, and June 30, 1950, of which number not more than 100,000 may be admitted during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "E," offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the magnitude of the resettlement problem should be discussed.

It is estimated that there are approximately 836,000 displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy who have to be resettled. Of this number about 611,000 are in camps or centers. These are figures based on reports of the preparatory commission for the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948. I have seen numerous other estimates and they are confusing because it is necessary to distinguish among displaced persons receiving care and maintenance, out-of-camp displaced persons eligible for care and maintenance but not receiving it, and other displaced persons who are receiving only legal assistance where they are, that is, are not part of the resettlement problem.

It may be remarked that these figures do not include Volksdeutsche or expellees, since, for reasons which can be treated at another place, they are not considered a part of the resettlement problem. The IRO constitution has not recognized them as such. From the evidence now in the RECORD it is clear that the Potsdam Agreement seems to settle those persons.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks table A and table B.

Table A summarizes the displaced persons population, in and out of camps, in Germany, Austria, and Italy, as of January 1.

Table B gives the nationality breakdown of those displaced persons.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to refer to them, except to make them a part of the RECORD.

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

United Nations displaced persons in the 3 western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy, as of Jan. 1, 1948

Country	United States zone			British zone			French zone			Italy, in camp	Totals		
	In camp	Out of camp	Total	In camp	Out of camp	Total	In camp	Out of camp	Total		In camp	Out of camp	Total
Germany	[1] 322,693	143,769	[2] 466,462	181,128	[3] 15,549	196,677	24,966	9,422	34,388		528,787	168,740	697,527
Austria	34,487	16,907	51,394	12,984	32,633	45,617	5,318	7,638	12,956		52,789	57,178	109,967
Italy [4]										[5] 18,579 [6] 10,916	29,495	(7)	29,495
Total	357,180	160,676	517,856	194,112	48,182	242,294	30,284	17,060	47,344	29,495	611,071	225,918	[7] 836,989

[1] Not including 14,535 displaced persons (mainly Poles and Balts) employed by U. S. Army in civilian labor service units.
[2] Excludes 13,000 Yugoslavs from out-of-camp in Italy transferred to British zone, Germany, in March 1947. (See footnote 7.)
[3] This figure consists of estimated 9,366 Poles and 6,183 Yugoslavs making up the civil fixed watchmen's service and other labor service groups.
[4] Not allocated by zones.
[5] Jewish. 7,000 in Hachsharoth and receiving PCIRO assistance and 11,579 in PCIRO camps.
[6] Yugoslavs, Poles, Ukrainians, and other nationalities in PCIRO camps.
[7] There are an estimated 100,000 displaced persons out-of-camp in Italy eligible for PCIRO assistance. No out-of-camp figure for Italy shown here or in 1946 charts, as no registration of these people has taken place.

United Nations displaced persons in the 3 western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy, as of Jan. 1, 1948 (by nationality, by country)

Nationality	Germany	Austria	Italy (in camp only)	Total
Polish (including Ukrainians)	291,886	30,539	3,670	326,095
Baltic	161,518	3,929	160	165,607
Soviet	14,487	3,997	320	18,804
Yugoslav	[1] 27,376	26,279	5,500	59,155
Jewish	[2] (153,572)	24,512	18,579	[3] 196,663
Others (including stateless)	83,691	20,711	1,266	105,668
Total	[4] 697,527	109,967	[5] 29,495	[4 5] 836,989

[1] This does not include an additional 13,000 Yugoslavs who were transferred to the British zone, Germany, in March 1947, from the out-of-camp displaced-persons population of Italy.
[2] Only 118,569 of this figure to be included in total as remainder is distributed among other nationalities in column.
[3] Only 161,660 of this figure to be included in total. See (2) above.
[4] Not including 14,535 displaced persons (mainly Poles and Balts) employed by U. S. Army in civilian labor service units in United States zone, Germany.
[5] Not including an estimated 100,000 displaced persons out-of-camp in Italy who are eligible for PCIRO assistance, but of whom no registration has ever taken place.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, an essential purpose of this legislation is to demonstrate America's good faith in urging solution of the whole problem and to fulfill the obligations to which we have committed ourselves. If we take for our entire share as few as 100,000 displaced persons, this purpose will be frustrated. Merely to make an ineffective gesture toward solution will be worse than nothing in terms of achieving practical progress, and will gravely damage our prestige at a time when it is most valuable to us.

In the absence of specific international agreement and in the face of varying and complex factors it is manifestly difficult to assess our fair share of the resettlement problem.

The figure of 50,000 annual admissions for 2 years, as contemplated by the committee bill, is obviously an arbitrary figure. Likewise our figure of 200,000 admissions over 2 years is confessedly arbitrary. But, we feel that to provide for the acceptance of any lesser number would be patently inadequate. We feel that 200,000 admissions is a conservative figure and reasonably adequate. It is to be observed that this figure is a far smaller part of the total burden than the United States has assumed as its share of comparable international tasks such as UNRRA, IRO, and the International Bank. It is far below the number which the United States might be expected to accept on the basis of population, population and population density weighted, and population and national income weighted.

An apportionment of our fair share on the basis of our assumed international financial contributions would be as much as 784,000, taking UNRRA contributions as an index and no less than 400,000 on a basis of our population compared with 25 other nations.

RESETTLEMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Too little attention has been directed to the fact that other nations have been alert to the displaced-persons problem, and have been active in attempting its solution. To no small extent the relief offered to displaced persons by other nations has been self-seeking. That is, they have recognized the value of displaced persons as new settlers and have promoted their immigration. That does not detract from the fact they have acted toward solution of the problem, and it is to be pointed out that in some instances this was done notwithstanding adverse domestic conditions.

Mr. President, I ask that table C be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

TABLE C.—*Estimate of resettlement of United Nations displaced persons from the 3 western zones of Germany and Austria and from Italy since the end of World War II to countries other than the United States*

Argentina	5,255
Australia [1]	1,699
Belgium	26,312
Brazil [2]	3,500
Canada	10,053
England	40,000
France	16,065
French North Africa	1,000
Netherlands	2,326
Norway	400
Paraguay [3]	3,421
Venezuela [4]	5,000
Peru	625
Total	115,656

[1] As of Feb. 12, 1948.
[2] As of Jan. 31, 1948.
[3] As of Mar. 13, 1948.
[4] As of Feb. 17, 1948.

NOTE.—Except as indicated, statistics are as of Jan. 1, 1948.

Small numbers have gone to the following countries: Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Mexico, South Africa, Sweden, Uruguay, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Tanganyika, Spain, Austria, Belgian Congo, China, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Greece.

Palestine: No statistics are available at the present time as to the number of Jewish DP's who were settled in Palestine.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this table shows an estimate of the number of displaced persons who have been resettled in countries other than the United States, in western Europe, South America, and the British Dominions. It is

deserving of some special comment. England lost something approximately like 1,000,000 homes by bombing during the war. Despite that fact, the United Kingdom already has received about 40,000 displaced persons. And these are in addition to about 200,000 Poles who were in England as members of General Anders' government-in-exile army, not classified as DP's because they did not come from DP camps. Belgium, despite its extremely high density of population, has already accepted about 26,000 displaced persons. The resettlement program in South America has been particularly successful, and new resettlement agreements are being negotiated.

The IRO Preparatory Commission has furthered the resettlement program by negotiating resettlement agreements with interested countries by assisting selection missions in the displaced-persons camps, and by transporting DP's for overseas resettlement.

In addition to the numbers already taken, other countries have committed themselves to accepting increasingly large numbers of DP's.

Mr. President, I ask that table D be made a part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

TABLE D.—*Remaining numbers of displaced persons to be resettled under presently outstanding plans and agreements (excepting the United States)*

(Estimate as of February 1948)

Country:	*Number*
Argentina	1,700
Brazil	1,500
Chile	4,000
Paraguay	800
Peru	4,400
Bolivia	400
Venezuela	10,000
Australia	18,000
Canada	9,900
England	60,000
Belgium	83,600
Netherlands	29,600
Total	223,900

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this table shows definite plans outstanding for the resettlement of DP's in other countries.

In this connection it is to be pointed out that these plans will fall far short of solving the problem unless the United States itself accepts 200,000, and United States participation in the project encourages these and other countries to increase their quotas. Officials dealing with this problem, in the IRO and in the State Department, constantly have stressed the importance of significant action by the United States in setting its sights reasonably high as a means of stimulating other countries to greater efforts.

HAS RESETTLEMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES SKIMMED THE CREAM?

I have observed that the interest of other countries in the resettlement of displaced persons has been to no small extent self-seeking. Those countries have recognized these displaced persons as a vast potential contribution to their cultures and economies. It has been suggested that as a consequence of that fact the cream of the displaced person population has been skimmed and that only the dregs remain. This I consider a specious argument where it is used against the admission of displaced persons to the United States. In the first place, only a minor fraction of the displaced persons population has been resettled. In the second place, the character of the displaced persons population as a whole has been rather definitely fixed as showing a very high proportion of skilled and agricultural workers. Despite the special demands in other countries for people of this character, their number is so great that it cannot be said only the dregs remain.

A staff member of the United States Employment Service has made a survey of occupational skills among 330,000 refugees in PCIRO assembly centers in Germany, Austria, and Italy. A summary of that report is significant, and I think it is well worth while to read it. It is as follows:

TABLE E

	Total males classified	Percent skilled	Percent agricultural workers
British zone, Germany	85,888	27.8	35.1
United States zone, Germany	90,507	34.8	17.5
French zone, Germany	14,431	26.6	39.1
Italy	14,656	42.0	23.2

THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM TO DATE

It cannot be said that the United States has been unaware of the displaced-persons problem, or that it has not been extremely helpful to the displaced persons of Europe, except in allowing them to enter this country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In connection with the skills and the types of persons who are left in the camps, is it not true that the largest numbers admitted into other countries were taken by Belgium, England, and France, and that in the case of England and France the great bulk of those who were taken were agricultural workers and in Belgium workers in the coal mines? So that, so far as industrial skills are concerned, the cream has not been taken off.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Massachusetts has raised a very interesting question, because it has been argued here time after time that we should take so many of the displaced persons, and that other countries would take so many if we would do so. The subcommittee which went to Europe last year had occasion to discuss this question with the ministers of France and England, and had occasion to find out what had been done respecting the admission of these persons. I wish to say to the able Senator that some men were being taken into France for agricultural purposes and some for construction work, but principally for coal mining, according to the information given us. Men were being taken into Belgium for coal-mining purposes, and for the same purpose and other purposes into England. Canada has taken several thousand for agricultural purposes and for timber work, and I believe there was one group of about 100 for tailoring.

Let me point out to the Senator that those taken into France had to leave their families behind. Those taken into Canada had to be single men; they did not take their families with them. The same is true of Belgium. Those taken into Belgium left their families, either in the camps or somewhere else.

The pending bill provides that the displaced persons may bring their families into the United States, so that there shall be no separation of families. So when the Senator talks about the number taken into Belgium and into France and into Canada he is talking about men who were separated from their families, and only upon the strictest selection are they taken into those countries.

I wish to say further to the able Senator that I happened to be present personally, as were other members of the subcommittee who went to Europe, when it was reported to General Clay in Germany that several thousand displaced persons had been sent back from Belgium because they did not fit in, and they were put back into the settlements in which they had previously been located.

So when the Senator speaks about the numbers that other countries have taken, let us all understand that they have been taken by the other countries upon a highly selective basis. Usually the requirement has been that the individuals taken be single men, or, if married, that they leave their families behind, and the individuals were selected because of their ability to perform certain forms of work.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan and all who have worked upon the bill are familiar with that fact. But, Mr. President, there must be a solution of the problem. America will not return the displaced persons to Russia or to her satellite countries, nor will America compel them to go back to countries where they will be persecuted, or perhaps killed very soon after they arrive. So the problem is one which must be solved. It is one of the problems growing out of the war. When America was in the war she knew that there would be many problems which must be solved after the war. Now it is 3 years after the war in Europe has ended, and the question is asked why peace has not been made. We in the Senate today are debating one of the problems which is an aftermath of the Great War. What do we expect from civilization if we cannot solve a problem which is no more than the solution of the question of what to do with the placing of approximately 600,000 human beings who want to live in liberty and freedom?

Mr. President, I say that we must solve the problem. The small share some of us are today proposing that America take of these displaced persons, 200,000 of them, is but a pittance of the whole number who represent the problem which is

facing America and the world today. I do not see how we can have true peace in the world without a proper solution of this problem.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Unfortunately I have been obliged to attend a committee meeting and did not hear all the Senator from Michigan has said. As I understand, the Senator, by the amendment he is advocating, proposes that the number of persons to be admitted to the United States shall be increased to 200,000, in order that we may make progress toward the solution of the problem respecting displaced persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to ask the Senator, if the ceiling is increased to two hundred thousand, is it not true that everyone admitted must comply with all the immigration regulations, everyone must be carefully screened, and there must be some way worked out whereby those who are brought in are adapted to do the work for which jobs may be available? Is not that contemplated by the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. We are not insisting that necessarily 200,000 must come in, but that we are willing to take up to 200,000 in order to help solve the over-all problem?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. And it is figured that there will be 200,000 qualified to come in under our immigration laws, subject to a very strict screening.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has spoken about the displaced-persons problem being a tremendous one. Even if the Senate were to adopt the Senator's amendment and permit the entry of 200,000 persons, and even though 200,000 should qualify to come in, and be brought here, would that result in solving the problem?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; we will not have solved the problem, but we will have shown by such action that we have taken a fair number, and then we can properly say to the other countries, "Come along and do likewise."

Mr. HATCH. And by that kind of a general cooperative effort the problem may eventually be solved?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. But without our making such an effort will it ever be solved?

Mr. FERGUSON. In my opinion it will not be solved, and will result in the development of a cancer which can spread and may result in becoming the nucleus for another war.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say, in addition to what the Senator from Michigan has said and what the Senator from New Mexico has said, that even if all the persons who can be properly admitted into the various countries are taken from the camps, it will not entirely solve the problem. There will be what is called a hard core left which will be a problem of the United Nations or some international organization for so long, in my opinion, as the two Senators and I are alive.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the statement made by the Senator from Michigan that, if the United States would take the action the Senator proposes it shall take, other countries will do thus and so. The Senator realizes that we have already taken into this country, and will have here by July 1 of this year, more displaced persons than any other country has taken in. That is a correct statement, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The pending bill provides for the admission of 50,000 persons a year for 2 years, or 100,000 in all. That number far exceeds that which any other countries have taken.

It must also be remembered that we take the displaced persons in by whole families, whereas other countries which have permitted the entry of displaced persons have required that they be single individuals, or, as I previously stated, if a man has a family, he must leave his family behind, and he must be selected for a particular job which is available in the country to which he is permitted entry, and which he can perform, and if he cannot perform it he is sent back, as has happened in Belgium. So when the Senator from Michigan argues that this country should take the lead and that the other countries will follow, I wish to point out to him that our country has already taken the lead, and taken a far greater number than has been taken into any other country, and under the pending bill we will do more than has been proposed or suggested be done by any other country in the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Notwithstanding the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. President, the fact is that America, according to population, according to wealth, according to industry, can absorb a greater number than even the number I propose, and then we will not equal what other nations have already done.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not understand the Senator from Michigan to say that if we did this thing all the other countries would do their full duty. We express the hope that they will, and we know that the problem can be solved only if all the nations cooperate. The Senator from Michigan did not say that they would.

Mr. FERGUSON. I could not speak for other nations.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, neither the Senator from Michigan nor any other Senator can speak for other nations, but what has been revealed by inquiries into what has taken place indicates what other countries will do if we shall admit large numbers of displaced persons. Other countries have not taken their share. We know that has not happened.

Let me say a word with respect to the Senator's statement that, because of our large population and the condition of our industry and wealth, it is our duty to take in a greater percentage of displaced persons than taken in by other countries. It is a fact undeniable that this country has the largest foreign-born population of any country in the world. I do not deny that many of those persons have contributed to the progress of America; but I think it is not sound argument to say that because we have a large population we ought to make it larger. I intend to speak upon that subject later on. I do not think it is sound to say that because we have a large population, by reason of that large population we could take a greater percentage of displaced persons into America. There are definitely other factors to be dealt with, such factors as conditions in our own land; the shortage of housing, for instance. We must consider what we would face if there should be a recession in employment. Those factors must be taken into consideration. I rose to challenge the argument and the logic of the able Senator when he said that because we have a large population we ought to take in more than some other country. It seems to me the reverse should be the case.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan, because I know he has devoted a great deal of time to the subject, what fact he relies upon when he says that if we adopt his amendment and take a large number of displaced persons into America other countries will then come forward and do the same. It occurs to me that they might agree with us to take in some at the same time we are taking in some. I should like to know what the prospects are for other countries taking in some displaced persons just because we have agreed to take in some of these unfortunate people.

Mr. FERGUSON. My statement was made upon the basis of consultation with members of the State Department who have been vitally concerned with this problem and have been in negotiation with other countries. They feel that we have now reached the point where America should act in order that other countries may have an inducement to proceed along the same line. With the International Refugee Organization as it is, we have done nothing except that which the President has done by an Executive order. He is allowing displaced persons to come in under the quota system; and it is expected that by July 1 of this year as many as 50,000 of them may have come into this country.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, a great deal of time has now elapsed; but if in the beginning we had decided upon a policy of taking a substantial number of these unfortunate people into the United States, it might have been the part of wisdom if our Government had called a convention devoted exclusively to this

single subject, and started the convention off with the program that we should take so many if other members of the convention would take their proportionate share. In that way we could make a dent in the big pile.

I am not out of sympathy with the objective, but I am somewhat skeptical that other countries will take displaced persons simply because we take them. The history of the situation is—and the report so sets forth—that countries which so far have taken them have used the selective process, taking the most valuable, the cream off the top, as it were. What we propose to do is not to take the cream at all, but to take the homogenous content.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much impressed by the statement of the Senator from Maryland. I think his skepticism as to the effect upon other nations of our taking displaced persons is well founded in the history of the situation. Strange as it may seem, since the war France has suffered from a shortage of labor. When France wanted workers did she seek them among the displaced persons? She obtained a few from that source, but she went to the Italian Government to make an agreement to get 200,000 Italian nationals to come into France and work. Last year when we were there she had obtained 60,000. That was all she had been able to contract for. Those Italian nationals came into France and worked. Does that indicate on the part of France a willingness to meet this problem? I think not.

Further with respect to France, and the very able men who head the French Government and are doing their best to reconstruct that country in a patriotic fashion, let me say that there are in France approximately 400,000 German military prisoners. They are there to this time. I understand that within the past few months some have been liberated. The right of freedom in France has been offered to Germans who, having been there for years as captive workers, would take up citizenship. We were told that approximately 110,000 had accepted that status.

Does that indicate on the part of France a desire to step into this problem and help solve it? No. The French are looking after the interests of their own country, very definitely.

Does the situation indicate on the part of Belgium, when she takes displaced persons solely as single men, or men who must leave their families behind, a desire to solve the problem? We were advised that displaced men could not bring their families into Belgium. The men were brought there for coal mining; and if they did not work as it was intended they should, were they resettled in Belgium? No. They were sent back for resettlement in the American and British zones.

In 1945, Canada, after having a royal commission examine into the subject, decided against permitting any immigration into Canada except from the Western Hemisphere countries and British possessions. Canada closed the gates, and then sent commissions to Europe and brought in selected single men, most of them Polish nationals from Anders' army. I am advised that 8,500 were brought in. The first ones came in as agricultural workers. Others were admitted as timber workers. We were advised in Europe that a request had also been made for 100 tailors. Since that time the categories of workers may have been expanded. I am not advised as to what has happened in the past few months, but we are advised that up to date 8,500 have come in.

So I say to the Senator from Michigan that I do not believe that his argument carries the weight which he feels it does. The Senator argues, after there has been a history on the subject, that action in admitting displaced persons will stimulate other nations to take them.

We are approaching this question from two viewpoints: First, from the standpoint of relieving and helping these unfortunate people; and second, from the standpoint of the interest of this country. How many can we take care of without having displacements in this country? How many can we look after, in fairness, in trying to solve this problem? That is what the committee considered.

The figure which the Senator suggests was under consideration by the committee. It was the top figure, the largest figure suggested to the committee. After weeks of deliberation and work, the committee arrived at the figure of 50,000 a year, under the restrictions and safeguards contained in the bill.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the questions which have been raised by the Senator from Maryland, to be: What assurance do we have that action taken by this country in admitting 100,000 or 200,000 displaced persons will encourage action by other countries? Would it encourage them to take displaced persons?

According to the report made in February 1948, by the executive secretary of the International Refugee Organization, covering the period from July 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947, 92,236 displaced persons were resettled; 9,302 came to this country, and approximately 83,000 went to other countries. The United Kingdom accepted 26,426; Belgium, 15,894; France, 12,743; and the United States, 9,302. The three countries which took larger numbers are smaller in population and resources than in this country. We have taken a total of 30,000. Upon the record of experience other countries have done a great deal for displaced persons, taking in consideration their resources.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is true, however, that while Belgium, Great Britain, and France have taken more in the space of time to which he refers, they selected those whom they would take, to fulfill certain economic shortages in the labor situation, whereas those who came to the United States came primarily on a purely humanitarian basis.

Mr. COOPER. I think that is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a wide distinction between the selfish approach to the problem and the unselfish approach. The point I wish to make is that this problem can be solved only if the entire pool is to be absorbed on an unselfish basis. So long as selectivity is practiced, I do not think we can solve this problem at all, because no nation will take more than it can fit, like the pieces of a puzzle, into a particular pattern.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I continue reading the report signed by the executive secretary of the PCIRO, of February 1948, page 17:

> Mass resettlement programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, contemplated the movement of 234,453 refugees to the 12 countries which were listed as having selection missions operating in the field—Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, France, the Netherlands, Peru, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, South Africa, and Switzerland.

In the report the statement is made that a definite agreement has been made with France on January 13, 1948, by which—

> The French Government agrees to receive as large a number as possible of eligible refugees during the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, under specified conditions, and undertakes to establish on its territory the refugees' families.

If the report is true, I think it is fair to say that arrangements have been made to resettle 243,000 displaced persons in France during this fiscal year.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has stated that France has taken many more displaced persons than the United States has, and the Senator also feels that France has taken more displaced persons in proportion.

Let me read some figures, as of February 17, 1948:

> The estimate of resettlement of displaced persons from the three western zones of Germany and of Austria and from Italy from the end of World War II to dates noted:
>
> In France, December 31, 1947, 16,065.

There is the exact figure. More than that number have long ago come into the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Twenty-nine thousand came into the United States during the same period.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to have the Senator quote me correctly. I did not say that more displaced persons had been accepted by France than by the United States. I merely said that considering her resources, France has done more than we have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I say that France never took more than her needs, because she shortly will be going to Italy

to get people to help take care of the French labor problem.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, to go back to the original question, I think our Government is to be commended for pioneering in this humanitarian field. But my question was directed to the Senator from Michigan on this point: It is a great deal easier to get the other nations of the world to agree to take a definite quota before we take our quota, than it is for us to get them to follow suit after we have acted. So it seems to me that we have rather lost our bargaining power in this situation. If we are to absorb the maximum number of these unfortunate people, it seems to me we would do more to accomplish that if we formed a general pool with the other nations of the world, rather than if we acted independently and then said to them, "See what we have done in this respect. Now be your brother's keeper and go forth and do likewise." So I am afraid we have lost the psychological advantage we could have had, Mr. President, in connection with persuading the other nations to take their proper quotas of these unfortunate people. By acting more or less in an independent fashion, we have lost that advantage, it seems to me.

So far as concerns the point that once we have acted in this matter, the other nations will follow suit—according to the statement of certain officials in our State Department that they hope other nations will emulate our example—nevertheless they have no commitment to that effect. So I am afraid we shall have lost our opportunity to influence other nations which are able to absorb certain numbers of these persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I simply wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that I feel that one of the reasons why we have lost this bargaining power—and I agree that bargaining power has been lost—is that the State Department has no authority, being a part of the executive branch of our Government, to admit these persons in excess of the quotas, because there is a strict immigration law upon the statute books, and therefore it is a very difficult thing to bargain about.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate that hurdle or barricade which is in the way, but certainly the United States could negotiate with other countries a treaty dealing with this subject, and it could be submitted to this body for ratification; and under such a treaty I think we could fairly well take care of the matter.

Or if there is a legal imperfection to such procedure we could initiate in the Congress legislation calling on the Chief Executive to meet with other nations, and say that we would commit ourselves in advance to accept a certain number, provided other nations similarly circumstanced with the United States would do likewise.

In other words, there are many ways in which we could have tackled the barrier which now stands in the way of the accomplishment of a solution of this problem, to wit, our immigration laws.

I was only calling attention to the fact that we did not do anything about it, and thus we lost this great opportunity in the way of bargaining power. In my opinion, it would have helped many thousands of these unfortunate people—far beyond the number contemplated to be helped by this bill—if we had gone about the matter differently. We might have reached the core of this problem if we had induced other nations to assume their fair share while we were assuming our fair share of these displaced persons.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that for some reason or other the European nations do not desire to admit displaced persons from the camps in the occupied areas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not say that is a fact, because they have accepted some of them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but they have accepted only a few selected individuals.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, we intend to make selections.

Mr. EASTLAND. I saw a statement by the Minister of Population of France that within the next 10 years France must have 3,000,000 additional workers if she is to survive. I saw figures indicating that in 8 of the 10 nations in the Marshall plan in the fall of 1948 there will be a need for 677,000 additional skilled workers in those 8 nations alone.

The statistics show that 60 percent of the persons in the camps in central Europe have skills. There is a need for them in Europe. There is not a need for them here. Why is it that the European countries will not take them?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I can answer that question.

The minority problem has been a serious one in every European country. They have never been able actually to solve the minority problem.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the minority problem?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall explain it. The only place where that problem is solved is in America. Our whole situation and our whole form of government are based upon the idea that all our people live under a system of equality under the law, and the minority groups have the same rights as any other groups, no matter what their nationality may be. But in Europe one of the real causes of the various wars has been that the people of Europe have not been able to solve their minority problems. They would persecute the people of one nationality or of another, and would be prejudiced against them. Such persons simply could not live in that country. That has been true in all the European countries.

But here in the United States, where so many of our people have comparatively recently come from foreign shores, many of these people would live in the homes of their relatives here. We know how to solve these minority problems. In the great State of Michigan it does not make any difference whether a man is a Pole, a Hungarian, a Czech, an Englishman, or of any other nationality. We try to do the best we can in the solution of these problems. When we have a war, we do not tell all those who have come from a country on the other side in the war—for instance, the German people who are in the United States—to go back to the land from which they came.

But what was done in the satellite countries under the Potsdam agreement? The Germans who for centuries had been in those other lands were told, because they were a minority, to take to the highway and get into Germany as fast as they could. They were not even permitted to take their belongings with them. Thousands of them died.

That is why the countries of Europe cannot solve this problem by themselves. We have to help solve it, subject to our Constitution and our laws.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it a question of minorities or is it a question of nationalities?

Mr. FERGUSON. Either one, call it minorities or call it nationalities.

Mr. EASTLAND. Which is it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say it is principally a matter of nationality, instead of minority. I classed the nationality as a minority. It is one and the same thing.

Mr. EASTLAND. In France, people of other nationalities are found. They are welcome in France. I do not think that could be the reason.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been one of the great problems there.

Mr. EASTLAND. France holds out that she must have 3,000,000 additional workers within the next few years. She invites people of other nationalities to come. The Senator cited the fact that last fall there had been brought into France 60,000 Italian laborers. It could not be a question of nationality. For some reason, they do not want inmates of displaced persons camps. I think that is obvious. Now what is the reason?

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I meant to address myself to the point raised by the Senator from Maryland, but I should like to say one word on the question last raised. The head of the IRO, Mr. Tuck, an American, has been studying this question. He has a staff that is constantly in touch with France as well as other countries. That problem is being approached as rapidly as possible. I do not know about the figure of 3,000,000 of which the Senator speaks. I have never heard of it. There has been a reference to some 50,000 or 60,000 people.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was announced by the French Minister.

Mr. SMITH. That would help solve the problem. I may say to the distinguished Senator that we have today under our care approximately 600,000 people in the camps, whom we are feeding through the PCIRO. If the whole joint movement of the nations were to collapse, we should still have to do something with that group. All we are asking is that there be set a ceiling of 200,000 in order to get the thing started. That means 400,000 must be placed somewhere else. Is not that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Michigan said this was a problem that grew out of the war and that it must be solved.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. In that statement he is absolutely correct.

Mr. SMITH. He is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. This bill is not going to solve it. Is it not a solution to move people into the British Empire, into the French Empire, into the Belgian Empire, and all over the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. SMITH. The question has been explored all over the world. There have been commissions going all over the world. They are trying to get settlements in Africa, and are working on that. They are trying to settle displaced persons in Santo Domingo, and are working on that. They are trying to get them into other countries. That is not the Italian case at all, which is still being worked on. All we are suggesting is that there be provided, of the 600,000 for whom we are responsible, a ceiling of 200,000 whom we are willing to attempt to place here, provided they meet our immigration requirements. It is a very reasonable suggestion to make.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator's statement lends support to the point I made a few moments ago in the discussion with the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from New Jersey says they have been in Africa, they have been all over the world, in an effort to place the inmates of displaced-persons camps, and that they have failed.

Mr. SMITH. No; I have not said that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to know if anyone else in the world wants them.

Mr. SMITH. Negotiations are proceeding. It is a very difficult problem, as we have found. The Senator from Maryland says, "Why was not somebody trying?" I may say that Mr. Tuck last summer, when we talked to him, was trying to get the different countries together. That was in September. I think the Senator was there. The purpose was to see if we could not agree upon some kind of acceptable quota, whereby we would take so many displaced persons, England would take so many, Australia would take so many, and so forth, all around the world. Our representative went over there. Our representative was sympathetic with it. He said, "We have no authority whatever because there has been no legislation enacted by the Congress and until there is legislation by the Congress it is impossible for us to negotiate."

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

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator and I are in agreement on the desirability of that process. What I was attempting to bring out was that I felt a great opportunity had already been lost.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that we may recapture as much of the opportunity as is still available, I think those who have made some study of the bill might consider this idea—and I offer it without any profound thought—that we provide for some sort of conference in order to see what can be done with a program on this subject, after we have taken whatever quota we care to take.

Mr. SMITH. I agree wholly with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, we should take this bill as the minimum for the purpose of providing that the President or the State Department shall contact other nations, either independently, bilaterally, or in a convention, to see what can be done to whittle this thing down to the irreducible minimum, rather than have the same thing said a year from now which the Senator from Michigan has just said, that there are imponderables in the way, and the State Department can do nothing about it. We ought to remove them from the further consideration of this problem, insofar as it is wise and practical, immediately in this bill. There ought to be some provision in the bill for the purpose of calling some kind of convention to deal with the problem. Does the Senator agree with me on that?

Mr. SMITH. I do, but I assume the Senator does not mean we should postpone any action on the pending bill until that is done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator wants this bill, for whatever number we agree on, as a starter, and then to have a convention called to clean up the whole thing. I agree with him, and will support his amendment to that effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am only pointing out that it would be better if we had done that initially, but, since it has not been done, in addition to passing whatever bill we deem wise, dealing with the subject that is now before the Senate, we ought to provide some way of dealing with the problem from now on, as we should have dealt with it from the beginning.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I agree with him entirely. He has made a very relevant suggestion.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope some Senator will offer an amendment to that effect, because a year from now, if the question comes up again, the same old excuse will be made, and we shall have done nothing in the meantime.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the suggestion of the Senator. I think it is very relevant.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senators for their contributions, but I recall that when we debated the resolution on the IRO it was particularly stressed that nothing in the resolution would permit in any way changing or altering the immigration laws, and the resolution specifically notified the State Department, the executive branch, "Congress alone will handle this problem." Although today I would certainly favor what the able Senator from Maryland has in mind—that we solve the problem so far as 200,000 displaced persons are concerned—yet there will still remain need for further action, and the State Department should be required to endeavor to get a complete settlement of the problem with other nations because we cannot go on with it alone.

Mr. TYDINGS. Unless we place such a provision in the bill, I am afraid the State Department will have a legitimate excuse that Congress did not ask them to do it, did not provide an invitation to do it; therefore they felt powerless to undertake it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Up to date I think they have felt that way.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Along the line so ably touched upon by the Senator from Maryland, the Senator will recall that under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, called the Marshall plan, the Administrator is required to encourage arrangements among the participating countries in conjunction with the International Refugee Organization looking toward the just and practicable utilization of manpower available in any of the participating countries, in furtherance of the objectives and purposes of the act. In other words, they are authorized to endeavor to get as many workers as possible into various countries and resettle them, if necessary. Under the provisions of the Economic Act, the term "participating countries" includes dependent areas. Moreover, the act provides for procedure in connection with certain projects fostered by private investors. I think the Senator from Michigan is apprised of the fact, as are other members of the committee, that in some of the dependent areas projects have been fostered by private investors which have resulted in the colonization of displaced persons with some satisfactory results.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the very thing the Senator is speaking of. That process is to be fostered and encouraged by the administrator under the Marshall plan. For example, a number of displaced persons have been settled in French Morocco. It is reported that there is a potential capacity in north Africa for the resettlement of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons. Workers are wanted there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator answer as to why they do not go there?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I suppose it is because they have not the work there, or they do not want to go. We cannot force them to go anywhere.

Mr. FERGUSON. We can never become a party to a system of enforced repatriation, and we should not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad the Senator has raised the question. If we ask persons in any of these camps, "Where do you want to go? Do you want to go to North Africa?", the reply is, "No; I want to go to America."

Mr. FERGUSON. We do not blame them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; but we have a situation to handle. We cannot open the gates and let them all come to America.

I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was speaking about general resettlement, not only resettlement in America.

Such a scheme has already been tried out in North Africa, where hundreds of

thousands are needed. It is stated that with, some success, they have already settled a large number of displaced persons in all kinds of construction work.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has put his finger on the problem. My fear is that a great number of people will not be content to go anywhere except to the United States. A great many of them will remain in the camps, always hoping that something will arise which will enable them to come to America. If they are to be absorbed by the democratic nations of the earth, each such nation will have to take a certain prescribed quota. But I do not think we are called upon to take all of them. I am not opposed to the philosophy of the bill and I do not intend to oppose it; we are attempting to do our part, but if no one else is doing anything, those persons will stay where they are. The only way the problem will ever be solved is by having simultaneous action with other countries.

Mr. President, before I sit down I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and other Senators for the fine work they have done in connection with this subject. I think the report is most informative as showing the dangers as well as the humanity woven into the question. I think we owe these Senators a great debt of gratitude, because without this factual information we never could have approached this problem nor seen its ramifications as we are now likely to see them because we have the report before us.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Before the Senator from Maryland leaves the floor, let me say that I believe he has opened a valuable field of discussion and has made some valuable suggestions. He suggests that the problem ought to be solved in toto, that nations agree to complete the resettlement of the displaced persons. I agree with him. He has asked, "Why has not the United States taken such action?

Mr. TYDINGS. Taken the lead.

Mr. COOPER. Public Law 146 of the Eightieth Congress, approved July 1, 1947, authorized the President to accept membership for the United States in the International Refugee Organization, but this provision was placed in the bill:

> That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

By inserting that provision, the Congress said to the executive department, "You cannot conclude any agreement; further, you cannot take any action which would indicate that there would be any agreement upon the part of the United States to resettle any of these persons." Having placed that condition in the law, can we today, properly and honestly, criticize the executive department because it has not initiated such steps? In all fairness, I do not think we can.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wrote that language.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator allow me to answer the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is just the point. We did err. But what I am anxious to do is to correct our error at the first possible moment, so that it cannot be said a year or 2 years from now that we perpetuated the error already committed.

I agree with the Senator that it is not fair for us to criticize the executive department. I meant no particular criticism of any department. I was criticizing the way we have handled the matter. I agree that it is not fair to criticize the executive department when it is bound with the strings which we ourselves wrapped around it.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I differ very directly with the able Senator from Kentucky and the able Senator from Maryland that the language which has just been read tied up the State Department and prevented it from doing anything.

Mr. TYDINGS. I accept the qualification from my good friend from West Viriginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The language simply said, "We subscribe to the IRO in connection with its efforts, and when you do something you cannot conclude an agreement that will break down the immigration laws of this country, or resettle persons here without first coming to Congress." I believe that is absolutely right. It would be an absolute surrender of the sovereignty of this Nation in the control of immigration if that language had not been written into the law. I take full responsibility for the writing of the language. I offered the amendment which has been read by the Senator from Kentucky. I say that if that language had not been placed in the resolution, Congress would have surrendered its power over the immigration laws of the United States. I am glad the language is in the law, and I hope it will remain there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is estimated that about 8,000,000 displaced persons were liberated from slave labor and concentration camps in Europe by the invading Allied armies. It is impossible to compute the number who were liberated by American troops, probably millions. It is a magnificent tribute to those armies and to the American troops in particular that about 7,000,000 DP's were repatriated in expeditious fashion. It is likewise a credit to the United States that it refused to be a party to any policy of forced repatriation where reprisal or persecution might await. Hundreds of thousands of the remaining were granted asylum in United States zones of occupation.

Some remarks have been made on the Senate floor today which would seem to favor forced repatriation. The Senator from Michigan does not believe in it. I hope the Senate of the United States does not believe in it. The United States Army did not believe in it. The Army tried to persuade the displaced persons to go back, but when they finally said "no," they were allowed to remain, and therefore forced repatriation was never actually put into effect.

About 60 percent are at present in United States controlled areas. We have contributed heavily toward their support. In fiscal 1947 we spent more than $130,000,000 for the maintenance of displaced persons who were living under our flag. With the establishment of the IRO, or its preparatory commisison, we authorized a contribution of more than $73,000,000 in fiscal 1948. But we are not acting either in their interest or in ours by continuing to maintain them.

On December 22, 1945, the President issued a directive whereby displaced persons were given preference in filling regular immigration quotas. It was a humane gesture, but it was no more than a gesture. It did not alter existing immigration laws other than by that preference. It did not permit an increase in the number of immigrants who might come to the United States. It did not give DP's any quota numbers unused in the past. It provided no basis of selection other than provided by the immigration laws and their quotas, and it is important to realize that the bulk of DP's are from nations which have the lowest immigration quotas.

About 30,000 displaced persons have been admitted to the United States under the directive. Those admissions have disproportionately represented the elements in the displaced persons population because of the quota restrictions. In no event can it be called a significant resettlement program. It has, at best, been a demonstration of intent which demands pursuing. It has given valuable experience to the voluntary agencies—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—who will be important factors in the orderly development and distribution of employment and housing opportunities for DP's in the United States. In this connection, however, it should be observed that these agencies can effectively tap their huge resources throughout the country only if they have a substantial goal. As few as 50,000 a year, divided among the various agencies and hedged about by restrictions, could not be expected to engender as much enthusiasm or produce as satisfactory results as a larger program.

THE SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The committee, in its report on S. 2242, states that "in arriving at a conclusion

as to the number to be admitted it was felt that an appraisal should be made of the situation in the United States." As I have observed before, I believe this is a reasonable consideration which any country should make.

QUOTA IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Our immigration quota laws have been in effect since 1930. The annual quota for all European countries is approximately 150,000. The average number of quota immigrants has been only about 35,000. The net immigration, that is, the excess of admissions over departures, was 603,357 as against a possible 2,768,396 quota immigrants who could have entered the United States in the last 18 years. As pointed out by the committee report, this situation is due in part to the fact that a few countries with large quotas have used only a relatively small percentage of their quotas. It is also due in part to other factors, such as the economic depression and the interruption of immigration caused by the war.

The quota laws do not afford material relief to displaced persons because the displaced persons of Europe, except the German Jews, are from countries with relatively small and heavily oversubscribed quotas. At the same time, reference to data on unused quotas indicates the extent to which our immigration laws have made allowance for absorption far beyond the demands that the proposed legislation would impose.

Reference to the history of actual, rather than potential, admissions under the quota laws gives an even more conservative basis for justifying the admission of 200,000 displaced persons over a 2-year period.

Between 1930 and 1947, excluding the war years 1942–45, an average of 41,846 quota immigrants and an average of 35,174 nonquota immigrants entered the United States each year. It can safely be said that, but for the war, 167,383 quota immigrants and 140,588 nonquota immigrants, a total of 307,912, would have entered this country in the years 1942–45.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has been using figures with respect to those who might have come into the United States. The total number of quota immigrants—and I am not referring to nonquota immigrants, but to quota immigrants—admitted to the United States during the six war years, which we call fiscal years 1940 to 1945, inclusive, was 132,876. That is the total number of quota immigrants.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not used the same years the Senator employs, so my figures would not correspond with his.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This refers to the war years. The able Senator has talked about those who came in during the war. That number is much lower than the quota figures, 132,876. That number is only 48,147 less than the quota immigrants who were admitted into the United States during the preceding 6 years; that is, before 1940. In other words, there is not such a great difference between the number of those who were admitted during the 6 years prior to the beginning of the war and the number admitted during the war. I merely call that to the distinguished Senator's attention.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have those figures. I had used the years 1942–45.

Actually, only 44,659 quota immigrants and 74,517 nonquota immigrants, totaling 119,176, entered in that period. The deficit of 188,616 approximates the number which we suggest in this amendment. Very little argument against such a number can be made upon the grounds of employment, housing, or assimilation, for it is reasonable to believe that such a number would now be in the United States under provisions of existing law, augmented by thousands of children born after entry, but for war conditions.

EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

At the outset it should be borne in mind that not all entrants under the displaced persons admission program will be competitors for employment, and that 200,000 persons does not represent a demand for that many housing units. It has been testified that at least 50 percent of those who would be admitted are women and children, and that therefore an estimate of 60 percent job seekers is probably too high. The average size of the family unit is 3.04. Assuming 52,000 single persons and 2,000 children are to be admitted, there would be left 146,000 in family groups, requiring about 48,000 family housing units.

The impact of these admissions upon employment perhaps can be best testified to by our labor organizations and by the Department of Labor. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has testified on this in House hearings on the Stratton bill, which proposed to admit not 200,000, but 400,000 persons in 4 years, which would be the equivalent of 200,000 in 2 years, as is proposed. Mr. Green has testified that the admission of as many as 400,000 displaced persons need have no appreciable effect on the labor market. Philip Murray, of the CIO, testified in the same manner. Moreover, Mr. Green suggested that even a mass entry of that number, not spread over a period as is contemplated in the present legislation, would have no ill effect.

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony in those same hearings was that of Phillip Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Labor, and I want to quote one passage from his testimony:

> This belief (that there are only so many jobs and an increase in population means joblessness) implies a loss of faith in the potentialities of our free-enterprise system, a loss of faith in America ac the land of unlimited opportunity.

I agree wholeheartedly with that remark.

We are at the moment in a period of record employment in the United States. At the same time there are areas of particular demand for workers. The Occupational Outlook, which is an appendix to the committee report is a significant reference. It shows that there is a particular demand for agricultural workers, who are given a preference in the pending legislation and who comprise 24 percent of the displaced-person employables.

Mr. President, every year we are obliged to import from other countries, for seasonal employment, many persons who go from one place to another place in America and work.

There is an acute shortage of domestic and institutional help in this country, and 10 percent of the DP's are classified in this group, including 20 to 25 percent of the registered female employables. There is reason to believe that the clothing and needleworkers industry is threatened in at least 10 States by a shortage of help, and 6.4 percent of those classified are in this category, including about 6,000 tailors.

As for housing, perhaps the best testimony can come from the National Housing Administrator. Mr. Raymond Foley, on May 23, 1947, wrote to Representative STRATTON, sponsor of the House bill that called for the admission of 400,000 displaced persons, that "enactment of H. R. 2910 could have relatively small effect on the over-all housing shortage and the Housing Administration has no objection to its enactment." As recently as February 11, 1948, in response to an inquiry as to whether his statement of last May held good in the light of more recent conditions, he reported "the situation has not changed materially."

Those statements, like the statements of Mr. Green and Mr. Murray on the labor situation, undoubtedly were based on over-all considerations. For instance, in housing, it is probable that Mr. Foley was correlating the probable demand for 48,000 family housing units to which I have referred, broken down to 11,500 rural units and the remainder urban or nonrural, against an indicated supply of 321,000 habitable vacant housing units in rural areas and 410,000 in urban or nonrural areas.

The bill provides for bringing in agricultural employees. We all know that on many farms where workers are hired, or where tenants farm, housing is already provided. There is a shortage of farm workers in some places, and if farm workers or tenant farmers are not available the houses are held idle, because those who own the farms want to wait until they can secure help which will occupy the premises.

More specific resettlement and employment opportunities are desirable, however, and are required in the contemplation of the pending bill. To that end the activities of voluntary organizations in this country have been remarkable. There has been organized an American Council of Voluntary Agencies, comprising virtually all of the interested Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant groups. In January its representative testified before the Senate subcommittee considering this legislation and expressed his confidence that if legislation were clearly stated as giving a significant goal, his agencies could clearly demonstrate an ability to place and absorb all the DP's who might be admitted.

He revealed that there had already been organized, and there was in process.

a national inventory or survey of possible placements. The results of that survey, and of spontaneous surveys in at least 9 States, are now being made available. The results clearly support his expressions of confidence. In Iowa, for instance, a local survey revealed a welcome for 1,460 family units, jobs for 3,320, and specific housing opportunities for 875 families. A Kentucky survey showed a definite acceptability of 5,000. An incomplete Minnesota survey showed an acceptability of 3,000.

I have requested a preliminary summary of the surveys that have been conducted in Michigan. I am sure it will prove typical of other summaries which will be forthcoming. The people of Michigan have seen fit to make a survey. They are interested in the problem. They recognize that it is one of the issues that must be settled by the world. They, together with the citizens of other States, recognize that it must be solved. They want to do their part. They want to get back to a basis of real peace, and the question of what to do wtih displaced persons is a matter we must debate and settle, in order that we may return to a condition of real peace.

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND IS A CEILING FIGURE, WITH SAFEGUARDS ATTACHED

In any consideration of the numbers proposed by this amendment it should be clearly borne in mind that 200,000 is a ceiling for admissions and not a fixed figure. The amendment merely contemplates authorizing the entry of a number up to 200,000 who have otherwise fulfilled conditions which would prevent injury to the interests of the United States.

That must be borne in mind. It is not the purpose to bring in by lot or luck 200,000 persons and land them on the shores of the United States, at the ports of entry, and forget this question. Oh, no, the citizens of America are more interested in America than that. But they want to try and solve the problem. They want to find housing for these persons, they want to find employment for them, they want to find a means of assimilating them into the great freedom-loving land of America. That is one of the things we should help them do.

We propose to double the maximum number contemplated by the committee bill, and I have demonstrated the reasons why we believe that doubling is justified. We also would permit unused opportunities in the first fiscal year to be used in the second fiscal year. This would compensate for the inevitable time lag at the beginning of the program while processing procedures are being established, opportunities are being developed, and transportation is being organized.

But all the safeguards of the bill as reported by the committee would apply equally to the additional number. If the total number authorized could not qualify, for any reason, then a lesser number than 200,000 would be admitted.

Mr. President, even though there has been a considerable time lag, we should seize the present opportunity immediately so that we may do our share in solving the problem.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment providing for the admission of 200,000 displaced persons into the United States during the next 2 years, if they can qualify for entry under our laws and our screening.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in the hope that we may reach an early vote so as to dispose of the pending amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Moore
Brewster	Gurney	Morse
Bricker	Hatch	Murray
Bridges	Hayden	O'Conor
Brooks	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Buck	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler	Holland	Pepper
Byrd	Ives	Revercomb
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Feazel	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Wilson
Flanders	Maybank	Young
Fulbright	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators, on page 3, beginning in line 25.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, without further delaying the vote on this amendment, I wish briefly to summarize, within a very few minutes, my position on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The whole effect of his amendment is to change the number who would be admitted. The committee bill provides that 50,000 a year shall be admitted for 2 years. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan raises the number from 50,000 a year to 100,000 a year. It does more than that. If 100,000 do not come in the first year, a number representing the difference between those who do come in and 100,000 is to be added to the 100,000 for the second year.

The figure of 100,000 a year provided for in the amendment was considered by the committee. It is the largest number suggested by anyone before the committee in its deliberations upon the bill.

There are many reasons why I feel—and why the majority of the committee feel—that this number should not be accepted. I invite the attention of Senators to some figures dealing with this subject.

In the first place, in considering the number who should be permitted to enter, we must also take into consideration those who enter under our immigration laws. Remember that the proposal in the amendment, like the proposal in the bill itself, is that, besides those who may now enter under our immigration laws, persons shall be admitted into this country for permanent residence. Under existing law, 150,000 persons may enter from the countries of Europe under what are known as the quotas. Others, known as nonquota immigrants, may come in. They are principally kinfolk of persons who are already here.

In addition to these classes, there is the category known as nonimmigrants. They are persons who come here on visits, for diplomatic purposes, as trade or treaty merchants, or persons who are supposed to be en route to other countries. So there are many persons who enter the gates of the United States each year.

In calling attention to these numbers, I hope they will impress themselves upon the Members of the Senate as showing the very broad welcome the United States under its laws, has given the people of the world during the years.

It is now proposed, both in the bill and in the pending amendment, that the number be increased. Seventy-six thousand nonquota immigrants came into the United States last year. Approximately 70,000 quota immigrants came into the United States last year. Three hundred and sixty-six thousand nonimmigrants entered the gates of our country last year.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan prevails, it will provide for entry into the United States and for permanent residence here of more than the total number of both the nonquota and the quota immigrants who entered the United States last year under our laws. I think that is an important point to bear in mind.

There are other reasons which had to be weighed by the committee in arriving at its conclusions. The committee met day after day and week after week, and we had the assistance of a staff which worked diligently with us. We had to weigh many points and consider many subjects.

The Congress of the United States must not forget that here in the United States we have problems which we cannot overlook if we are to be fair to our own people. Today there are in the United States 2,000,000 families without housing—not 2,000,000 people, but 2,000,000 families throughout the country. Are we to disregard their situation? I say we cannot do so. There are 2,000,000 young men, veterans of the war, who now are in school, waiting to graduate from school and to take up their life work in this country. Are we to ignore their situation? I think that cannot be fairly done.

So, Mr. President, without reviewing all the processes through which the committee went in its attempt to arrive at a fair figure in meeting this problem, I point out that the committee has arrived at the figure 50,000.

The population of the United States is increasing. That is another matter to which we must give attention. For instance, I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Times of March 11, 1948, based on an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, D. C., on March 10, 1948. It reads in part as follows:

The United States population reached a new high of 145,340,000 at the start of this

year, after 1947 proved the biggest single year of growth in history.

Mr. President, these are great and difficult problems that we must meet. Regardless of whatever our feelings in the matter may be, the figures in connection with these problems must be weighed and must be carefully considered, when we contemplate increasing the number of persons who may enter the United States from other countries, to be permanent residents of the United States.

Mr. President, we have reviewed the work of the committee, as set forth in the report. A reading of the report will present the picture and the figures in connection with it.

So, without further debate, I wish to state that I feel that the committee should be sustained. Although the members of the committee were not in entire agreement throughout the consideration of this matter, finally, after many weeks of work upon the subject and after a consideration of the great number of facets of the problem, we reached the conclusion which is set forth in the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to sustain the committee in its work, so that we may meet the problem and so that we may try out the proposed solution over the course of 2 years. Let us try to meet it on the basis of the committee's work and the committee's recommendation, which is the result of very extensive efforts on the part of the committee. Let us try to meet the problem in this way. If we do so, and if thereafter it is found that we can handle more of these persons, then the provisions of the bill can be changed later on. But at this time, at the beginning of this new venture, I ask the Senate to sustain the committee in its work.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The pending amendment is one of several which present a complete picture; and if they are adopted, they will destroy the committee bill and will repudiate the work the committee has done.

I think the pending amendment should be considered in the light of amendment K, which later will be offered. Amendment K provides that on page 2, in lines 5 and 6, the word and figures "December 22, 1945," be stricken out, and in lieu thereof there be inserted "April 21, 1947."

The distinguished Senator has made a very fine argument, but I think he should discuss amendment K at this time, so that the Senate can properly face the issues which are involved. Amendment K is really a part of the amendment now pending.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, amendment K relates to another phase of the bill. The pending amendment E deals solely with the numbers of such persons to be admitted. I believe that without further discussion, inasmuch as the Senate is fully apprised of the facts, we can proceed to vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators, being the amendment lettered "E," beginning on page 3, in line 25.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay a vote on the amendment. If the Senator from West Virginia prefers to have the amendment voted on now, I shall postpone making some remarks which I have prepared on the bill generally and also on the amendment the Senator has offered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has addressed an inquiry to the Senator from West Virginia, and no doubt the Senator from Rhode Island will wish to repeat it.

Mr. McGRATH. I thought I had an understanding with the Senator from West Virginia that I would not delay a vote on his proposed amendment if he wished to proceed with it now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. McGRATH. However, the remarks I wish to make on the bill deal somewhat with the subject matter of the amendment itself. I am perfectly agreeable either to make my remarks now or to make them atfer the vote is taken. My preference would be to make them at this time.

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

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understood from the Senator he would be perfectly agreeable to proceeding with the vote on this particular amendment, if the Senator might be recognized and proceed with what he may have to say, after the vote is taken.

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

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Rhode Island is going to speak on the subject matter of this particular amendment, I am sure he will speak with his usual ability, and I think it would be a mistake for him to wait until after the amendment has been voted upon.

Mr. McGRATH. I may say, Mr. President, the subject matter of the amendment is also a part of the subject matter of the substitute bill which the Senator from New Mexico and myself have introduced. Whether we shall call it up or not after the work on the committee bill is concluded, depends largely upon the degree of perfection we have been able to write into the committee bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I may clarify the situation somewhat, in order that the position of the Senator from Rhode Island may not be misunderstood, or my position either, for that matter. I have not spoken on this question, because I wanted a vote, and I did not want to delay the action of the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Rhode Island is strongly supporting the amendment, is he not?

Mr. McGRATH. I am strongly supporting the amendment to permit the entrance of 200,000 displaced persons over a period of 2 years. I shall vote for the amendment when the vote is taken. If it fails on the vote, I shall offer a substitute for the committee bill, so we may have another opportunity to consider the question of the number of displaced persons that should be admitted.

I am perfectly willing to proceed to a vote now on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan and make my remarks after the vote is taken, if that is the wish of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the light of the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island, I want to make the statement for myself also, that I not only favor this particular amendment but if it should fail, regardless of the other amendment, I think we would be compelled to offer the substitute proposal we have for the entire bill. But, like the Senator from Rhode Island, I do not now desire to delay the vote, but am perfectly willing that it be taken at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chief Clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Moore
Brewster	Gurney	Morse
Bricker	Hatch	Murray
Bridges	Hayden	O'Conor
Brooks	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Buck	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler	Holland	Pepper
Byrd	Ives	Revercomb
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Feazel	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Wilson
Flanders	Maybank	Young
Fulbright	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "E" submitted by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator

from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Brewster	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarthy	Thye
Cooper	McGrath	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wherry
Ecton	Martin	Wilson
Ferguson	Millikin	Young
Flanders	Morse	
Fulbright	Murray	

NAYS—33

Butler	Dworshak	Hill
Byrd	Eastland	Holland
Capehart	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Chavez	Feazel	Kem
Connally	George	Langer
Cordon	Gurney	McFarland
Donnell	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Malone	Revercomb	Stennis
Maybank	Robertson, Va.	Tydings
Moore	Russell	Wiley
O'Daniel	Sparkman	Williams

NOT VOTING—23

Baldwin	Lucas	Taylor
Ball	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	McClellan	Tobey
Bushfield	Magnuson	Umstead
Green	Myers	Wagner
Hawkes	Reed	Watkins
Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.	White
Jenner	Stewart	

So the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators was agreed to.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2389, for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$2,335" insert the figures "$6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

H. M. KILGORE,
E. H. MOORE,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MOORE. This is a private claim bill which the House passed in the amount of $7,790, and which the Senate amended by striking out "$7,790" and inserting "$2,335." The conferees of the respective Houses have met and have agreed to recommend the compromise figure of $6,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the South has often been severely criticized for her so-called one-party system. On numerous occasions I have heard the charge that we "blindly vote Democratic." Those who make such a charge might well study closely the South's great need for world markets for her products.

In supporting in the past the political party which believes in expanding world trade, the South has upheld the best interests of the Nation. If the United States had followed the policies of the Democratic Party, there would have been no depression and no World War II.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has learned nothing from the bitter experiences of the past. That party is not suited to govern the United States in the twentieth century. The moment the Republican Party achieves even the smallest majority voice in the affairs of the Nation, we begin to hear talk of high tariffs.

Today we are faced with an attempt by the Republican leadership in Congress to shut off the fine relationship between the United States and many other nations resulting from 14 years of successful operation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I submit at this point some observations of my fellow Mississippian, Howard Suttle, a Washington correspondent and radio news reporter, whose column, Liftin' the Lid on Washington, is published by several southern newspapers. Mr. Suttle aptly points out that the reciprocal trade program has been developed under the "back-scratch" principle of "live and let live." It permits tariff reductions on imports to America from friendly nations only when such nations permit proportionate reductions on exports of our products to their people.

Mr. Suttle's column is printed in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News and other southern newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(By Howard Suttle)

WASHINGTON.—Republicans who criticize the South's so-called one-party system might well give close study to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which expires June 12 unless Congress acts soon to extend it.

It was about 15 years ago that Tennessee's great Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, successfully championed adoption by Congress on an international scale of the principle of "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" in America's program to sell her surplus agricultural and industrial products in world markets.

It's the same principle under which George Godwin, the advertising and publicity genius who prefers living in his native Mississippi to a five-figure income in the maelstrom of Manhattan, developed the annual "back-scratch" celebration of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce.

The Hull-sponsored program today faces abandonment by a Republican-dominated Congress whose age-old high-tariff policies have done more than anything else to prevent the GOP from making headway in the South.

SELLS FARM PRODUCTS ABROAD

There are those who contend that southerners today "vote democratic because my father and my grandfather voted democratic." However, a better analysis would be that Dixie citizens vote democratic because that's the side of our bread which has butter on it—or maybe we now should say, "which has margarine on it."

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does not abrogate any existing tariff laws. It simply permits the President, through the State Department, to enter into agreements with foreign nations whereby import duties on certain of their products may be lowered if they will grant the same concessions to specific American products.

The program, in effect for 14 years, has resulted in the sale of billions of dollars' worth of cotton, beef, tobacco, and other

products of southern agriculture. In fact, last year, America sold $14,400,000,000 worth of farm and industrial products to foreign nations under the plan, while importing products aggregating only $5,700,000,000—less than half the value of our exports.

True enough, we've had our troubles with the program. On one occasion, President Roosevelt worked out an agreement with Argentina whereby the nation was flooded with imported canned beef at a time when we had a surplus of domestic beef. We imported the beef, however, in order to sell the Argentines more American products. Generally speaking, the program has been a great success.

GOP PLAN WEAKENING

Mississippi Members of Congress well realizing the need for foreign markets in which to move Magnolia State farm products, favor extension of the reciprocal-trade plan with little or no change.

The outcome is in doubt, for the Republican leadership plans some amendments that would reassert the principle of high tariffs as set forth in the famous Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930, which the late Senator Pat Harrison so vigorously opposed and stumped the Nation in unsuccessful efforts to defeat.

Currently, the GOP leans toward a so-called flexible import fee plan proposed by Senator GEORGE MALONE, freshman Senator from Nevada. Because of the national reaction to the word tariff, as a result of the Smoot-Hawley Act's unpopularity, MALONE uses the expression, "fee," to designate import duty.

But the Nevadan's bill restricts the proviso permitting agreements between America and other nations interested in trading with us. While he contends the proposal would encourage imports, it has the safeguard of a flexible duty that could be revised on the basis of production costs in foreign nations.

MALONE proposes the prevailing standard of living as a yardstick, which would permit revision of import duty rates to protect American standards. He would provide for increase in duties in event a foreign nation adjusted its currency in efforts to achieve competitive advantages.

The legislation would permit free trade between nations whose living standards were declared by the foreign trade authority to be comparatively the same as the United States.

ABANDON MUTUAL AGREEMENTS

Democratic leaders are vigorously fighting the MALONE proposal, chiefly because they contend it would mean a return to old reactionary methods of fixing tariffs and abandon the practice of entering into mutual agreements to help trade.

While many Southern Democrats are at odds with President Truman and oppose his nomination for a full term because of his stand on so-called civil rights, there is a virtual unanimity of feeling with respect to the reciprocal trade program which Cordell Hull successfully championed.

And today, George Marshall, who holds the Secretary of State's post occupied by Hull when the Reciprocal Trade Act became a law, feels that the plan "is the cornerstone and keystone of our foreign economic policy."

Yes, Republicans who charge that Dixie has continued to blindly vote Democratic might well consider the effect of the age-old GOP high-tariff policy upon the South.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGRATH obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators have asked me if there will be any further record votes today. I should like to say, as I did yesterday, that the desire is to conclude the consideration of the displaced persons bill tonight if possible. I see no reason why we cannot finish it. At least I am optimistic.

Let me state what we are up against in connection with the business of the Senate. If this bill shall go over, then, under the unanimous-consent order already entered, the time tomorrow until 3:30 o'clock will be allocated to the conference report on the so-called Bulwinkle bill. By unanimous consent the debate on the report will run from 12 to 3:30, and we would like very much, after that, if it shall meet with the approval of the Senate, to take up the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. There is also the measure extending the Second War Powers Act, in which the distinguished Senator from Vermont is intensely interested, and which he would like to have passed tomorrow if possible. So that program would make a pretty full day.

If the consideration of the pending bill shall not be completed today, it will mean carrying it over until Tuesday, and all Senators know that the draft bill is awaiting debate, and there are other pieces of major legislation. I should deeply appreciate the cooperation of Senators—and they have been very wonderful in their cooperation—in remaining here this evening to see if there will not be a chance to have the displaced persons bill passed. There are several amendments to be offered, and when we pick them all up they make quite a handful, but my feeling is that they will not all be offered, and the only way to find out about that is to remain here and vote.

I deeply appreciate the fact that Senators have been most cooperative, but we will have to continue to cooperate, and if we are to succeed in passing at an early date the pending bill we will have to have more cooperation even than we have had.

I know that some of the speeches to be made are important, and I beg Senators not to think for one moment that I am at all disparaging the addresses to come, because I know the ability of those who will participate in the debate, and appreciate the importance of the provisions which will be set forth in the substitute, and we all honor the distinguished Senator who is about to give us his version of the displaced persons bill.

After all the addresses have been concluded, Mr. President, we will have to start voting, and I at least would like to leave this word with my colleagues now, that it is the intention to finish the displaced persons bill tonight if possible. I ask Senators to remain here and use all the time necessary to complete their addresses as quickly as may be possible, and let us vote and dispose of the bill sometime tonight, before Senators go to their homes, because tomorrow the Senate will recess until next Tuesday.

I thank the distinguish Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. Unfortunately I had to make this announcement just as he was about to begin his address, and I do not want him to feel at all that my remarks have been made at this particular time with the idea of any reflection upon the good offices of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. I well understand the problem confronting the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now ask that my amendment D be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield for the purpose suggested by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to have the amendment read.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, beginning with line 10, it is proposed to strike out down to and including the period in line 14, and to insert in lieu thereof "visas issued pursuant to this act, shall, insofar as possible, be made available to each element or group among the displaced persons, as such elements or groups were segregated or designated for the purpose of being cared for by the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948, in the proportion that the number of displaced persons in such element or group bears to the total number of displaced persons, it being the purpose of this provision to insure, insofar as possible, that no discrimination in favor of or against any such element or group among the eligible displaced persons shall occur."

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

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I send to the desk two amendments to the pending bill, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

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

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, while I am fully cognizant of the necessity for haste in the Senate from now on, and realize the urgency of coming to a vote as soon as possible on the bill before the Senate, together with the amendments which have been or will be proposed, I nonetheless believe it absolutely necessary, in order that we may all vote intelligently, that some of the issues presented by the proposed legislation be clarified, or perhaps I should say that the large number of issues which are not presented by the proposed legislation be eliminated before we attempt finally to make up our minds.

I shall not restate the affirmative case for the displaced-persons bill. This has been ably and thoroughly covered by

the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], both of whom have made an exceptionally thorough study and presentation of the matter, and by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], whose knowledge of the problem extends back to the earliest time at which America began to confront it, and whose grasp of it is not, I believe, surpassed by that of any other Member of this body. Support for legislation assisting displaced persons has also been given by the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I wish merely to associate myself with the affirmative case so made, and to pass on to the matter of analyzing what the true issues before us are as I see them.

In the first place, I wish to emphasize my entire agreement with the position of the Senator from Wisconsin when he says that we should not approach this problem in an emotional way which will obscure the facts and practicalities of the situation. In the year and a half since legislation was first proposed on the subject of displaced persons, a number of emotions have been evoked in discussions and have even found their way into certain legislative provisions. Not all these emotions are as creditable as the humanitarian concern for exiled fellow human beings against which we have been so eloquently urged to be on our guard. Among the other emotions which have entered into the discussion of the problem, I might list the following:

First, prejudice. It is entirely understandable that various groups within this country should feel a more direct concern with the plight of fellow members of their own group abroad than with others who may be in the same condition. I am happy to observe, however, that to my own personal knowledge the great welfare agencies representing these diverse groups have exhibited a real spirit of cooperation and mutual tolerance, with the result that the foreign-language groups and the great religious and welfare organizations, including those representing the Catholic and Protestant churches and the Jewish religion, have consistently and unanimously set their faces against any and all provisions which would discriminate in favor of or against any element or group among the displaced persons of Europe.

Unfortunately, this admirable spirit has not prevailed amongst some of those who have opposed this legislation. I know all of us have heard whispers to the effect that only this element or that element is interested, for its own selfish purposes, in helping displaced persons. I know all of us have heard it said that the displaced persons are all Communists, that they belong predominantly to one religious group, that they are all thieves, racketeers, or worthless derelicts. I shall not now take time to repeat the overwhelming refutation of all these charges which friends of this legislation have had to repeat time and time over and over again—each time without the vestige of successful answer, but each time also only to see the same accusations arise again in different or disguised form. My purpose now is not to refute them, since they now need no further refutation. I merely wish to point out that the prejudice which gives rise to this sort of unfair and unwarranted attack on people helpless to defend themselves is an emotion against which we must all be constantly on our guard.

A second emotion which we must recognize and try to control in our dealings with this situation is one which has an impressive Latin name — xenophobia. That means the unreasoning fear and dislike of persons from other lands than our own, without regard to their individual merits. An emotional approach, based on this emotion, will clearly make rational consideration of our problem impossible.

The third and possibly the most important emotion which may well distort our whole approach to this, as to many other problems, is an exaggerated feeling of insecurity. No one can help being aware that the times in which we live are dangerous. The fate of the world is obviously less certain than it was before it had been disrupted by two great world wars. And it is to that extent insecure. That is not, however, a reason why the people of the greatest Nation of the world should approach the concrete problem that it must meet in an atmosphere of fear and hysteria. To be more specific, I am sure we all feel that there are grave uncertainties inherent in America's economic future. This, however, should not lead us to feel so insecure as to believe that the admission of 200,000 productive individuals into our Nation of 140,000,000 is going to disrupt our economy and render our citizens jobless and destitute. So, also, the very real menace to our interests which the present attitude of the Russian Government represents must not make us feel so insecure that we become incapable of discussing rational solutions for any problem once the opposition to such solutions has raised the bogey of communism.

For these reasons, I wish again to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his statesmanlike warning that this problem must not be approached solely on the basis of shallow emotionalism, and I wish to join him in urging that the issues that confront us be soberly and realistically analyzed on their merits.

Mr. President, if we are accurately and realistically to meet the problem before us, we must be constantly on our guard against a number of widely accepted misconceptions. For instance, ever since legislation to aid displaced persons was first suggested, a tremendous barrage of statistics has been laid down to show that we are practically dominated in this country already by a huge alien population. The most common figure cited is 6,000,000. Yesterday, on this floor, we heard the assertion that there were five or six million aliens now in this country. The fact is, as was extensively testified to by the Commissioner of Immigration, that in June 1947 there were considerably less than 3,000,000 aliens in this country—a number which was then and had been for many years rapidly decreasing, as the people who were admitted in the unlimited immigration era of the last century grew old and died or attained naturalization.

Similar assertions related to an allegedly huge influx of illegal immigrants. This is not the time nor the place to examine in detail the mass of confusion and even misrepresentation which has surrounded this subject. I will say only this: Regardless of what the situation may have been before the war, the shipping since the war has made the task of coming to the United States or Mexico or Canada, legally and illegally, extremely difficult. When there is added to that difficulty the constantly increasing stringency of our own, as well as Canadian and Mexican, immigration enforcement, it makes entirely plausible the statement of the Commissioner of Immigration that illegal entries by persons who come from overseas have not in recent years exceeded a number in the very low hundreds annually. But I do not wish to spend time arguing the confused and confusing details which surround the general immigration problem. I do not believe we are prepared to discuss that problem, as we consider the bill before us, particularly, inasmuch as the subcommittee appointed to study it has admittedly not completed its study. I furthermore do not wish to discuss it at this point, because I do not believe it is relevant to the problem before the Senate.

I do not agree with the statement of the able Senator from West Virginia that this problem has a direct bearing on the immigration policy of this country. It was the plain determination of this body last year, at the time when Senate Resolution 137 was agreed to, that the question whether displaced persons should be admitted should be kept entirely separate from the question of general immigration policy; and I am sure that all the Senators present at that debate recall the stress which was put on the point that the legislation proposed for the admission of displaced persons was to be of a temporary emergency character and was not in any way to be construed as relaxing or in any way changing the general immigration policy of this country, until that policy is changed by a specific act of Congress.

Another thinly veiled suggestion which stands constantly in the way of a realistic attack on this problem is that there is substantial danger of Communist infiltration through bringing in displaced persons.

Mr. President, if I believed this for one moment, if I believed for one moment that there was even a slight danger of it, I should vigorously oppose their admission. But I do not believe it. I know it is not so. References to the possibility that the DP's constitute Communists, references both in the report of the subcommittee and in the statements on the

floor of this Chamber, are totally undocumented. At page 20 of the committee report I note particularly the following language:

The view was expressed, however, that a few Communists may be among the displaced persons.

The view was expressed. I can assure the Senate that the view has often been expressed that they were all Communists—not only a few. But the expression of that view does not make it a fact. I can also assure the Senate that nothing could be further from the truth, as testified to by the endorsements of the great Christian religious groups which are working in this country for the admission of their coreligionists under the plan now before us. These great church leaders are not Communists, and they are not interested in bringing Communists to our country. The very endorsement of this program is the finest guaranty we have or that we should need, that the people they will bring from the displaced persons camps are not Communists.

The incident recited on page 20 of the subcommittee report is illustrative and typical. It dealt with a situation in which official Russian propaganda agents could not even achieve a hearing in a displaced persons camp. As a matter of fact, the incident is somewhat understated. The fact is that the Russian agents barely escaped with their lives, due to the intercession of American military personnel.

Mr. President, the displaced people have lived closely together in homogeneous groups for a long time. No informed person denies that the overwhelming majority are violently anticommunistic and violently Christian. I do not believe, and I do not think that the persons directly responsible for their care over the past few years believe for one moment that Communists can infiltrate or have effectively infiltrated this group. I do believe, of course, that every precaution should and must be taken to see that they do not. But I feel strongly that to make unsupported insinuations the basis on which we shall or shall not pass adequate displaced persons legislation would be entirely unwarranted.

One final matter which has been mentioned several times, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, as somehow discrediting the efforts to make this legislation adequate is that of the pressure which it is said has been exerted on behalf of the displaced persons. To my mind the discreditable thing is not that there may have been such pressure, but that it should have been needed or thought to have been needed, for it is now three long years since the world and ourselves became aware of the plight of these unfortunate people, and they still await our constructive action.

I would agree that if misleading propaganda has been used, this would have been grounds for criticism against those who used it. It could not possibly be grounds for punishing the innocent people in whose behalf it may have been mistakingly used, if that were the case. But so far as I know, inaccurate propaganda on behalf of displaced persons has been held to a minimum.

The position of the proponents of displaced persons legislation is set forth in the greatest detail in the hearings before the House subcommittee last year. It is my impression that their testimony has since been substantiated by the first-hand observations of Members both of the House and of the Senate, including myself.

Both the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia have alluded to the fact that the displaced persons are relatively well-fed. They have told us that they are not kept behind barbed wire. Mr. President, I know these things to be true. I do not think that this detracts one iota from statements which have been made as to the miserable character of their existence. Even more strongly than I believe that stone walls do not a prison make, I believe that stone walls or barbed wire are not necessary to make a prison, to imprison a human soul. I think it is enough that these people are forced to remain homeless and cannot be self-supporting or engage in meaningful community life. I do not deem it more than a partial mitigation of their otherwise unbearable situation that they are fed at a minimum standard of reasonable subsistence and are not kept behind barbed wire.

One further point is worth mentioning in connection with the allegation about pressure. The major documentation for these allegations is an attack on the group sponsoring displaced persons legislation published a year ago by another group which has since changed its mind on the subject. All of the records relating to the supporting group have been meticulously filed under the Reorganization Act, and are fully available to Members of this body. Had those records been consulted, instead of the unofficial publication of a hostile organization, I am sure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would not now include as a $15,000 a year employee of the supporting group a man who was employed at that rate for approximately 2 weeks in the process of setting up the organization, nor a man who died in July 1947; nor would the list include, out of a total of 23 individuals, 15 who terminated their services on or before July 31, 1947.

My point here is not to defend this lobby or any other lobby. If my colleagues wish to investigate the wrongdoing of lobbyists, I shall give them my vigorous support, no matter whom it may affect. But let us not run the risk of punishing innocent displaced persons because such people as Owen J. Roberts, William Donovan, Edward Stettinius, and Virginia Gildersleeve wish to help them, or because the Catholic Church, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and the Jewish religious organizations, as well as more than 125 national organizations of the highest character wish to help them, and come here to exert their influence upon us. If these individuals and organizations, or if the more than 10,000 individual contributors to their cause have in any way engaged in improper lobbying—which I certainly would not defend if it were proved—that should not close our eyes to the true issue before us. We should not close our eyes to that fact, but we should not visit punishment for it upon the displaced persons.

Such approaches are all negative. They are, to be sure, grounded on appeals to patriotism and to anticommunism. I think I am as patriotic, and I believe myself to be as anticommunistic, as anyone else; but my patriotism leads me to believe that the economic and social fiber of this great Nation of 140,000,000 people can survive the admission of a pitiful handful of useful, democratic people—200,000 in 2 years. I have faith, and I think the people of the United States have faith, that our country is capable of doing at least that, bringing them here under a law which is workable, and properly placing them.

My anticommunism makes me want to see this country triumph in solving a problem which we got into largely because of the inhumanity of those countries that subscribe to the ideals of communism.

Therefore, the true question is not, Can we do it? Of course we can. The question is, Should we? I say that we should, even if it might cause some minor inconvenience, as it must have caused to the devastated countries of Europe which have already done more in proportion than we now propose to do by any of the bills that are pending. They have done so in the face of the severest shortages of housing and even of food. But I know that the proposed admissions will not cause inconvenience to this country or to our people. I cannot bring myself to believe that the Nation-wide survey of the Catholic churches and the numerous State-wide surveys in which all churches have cooperated can be lightly tossed aside as inconclusive or half-heartedly done, or done in a spirit of deception of the Congress itself, simply because they have not prepared in advance of the passage of this legislation a list of the specific houses and the names of the specific factories to which people not yet selected might be assigned. I think, as the State survey committee from Wisconsin has stated, that once legislation is passed the question will be how a real, rather than an imaginary, problem can be met, and that there will be an overwhelming response from American people in all areas when the actual need is disclosed.

Mr. President, I wish to say only one thing further before I close these general remarks. There has appeared some apparent opposition to raising the ceiling figure in the bill to 200,000. I find myself completely unable to understand the arguments on which this opposition could be based. It was apparently thought that the admission of 200,000 persons in 2 years would hamper our economy and increase our housing difficulties. I am happy that since these remarks were in course of preparation, prior to the vote on the last amendment, the Senate by a very decisive vote has seen fit to face this issue and remove at least this defect from the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. President, as we proceed to the further consideration of the amendments which will make this proposed law work-

able, I hope we shall do so with an open mind and an open heart and in a true spirit of patriotism and love of our fellow man, in the realization that we are going to solve one of the human problems left by the war. I realize that the Senate has spent many days and nights in trying to meet the economic effects of the recent conflict. But, Mr. President, the human effects are more important. If the life of one of these persons is salvaged, if an opportunity is provided for one of these little families to start life anew, that is more important, to my way of thinking, to the future of our great American democracy than are the many millions of dollars which we appropriate for expenditure in the economic field.

There is perhaps no greater challenge before the Congress at this session than that we should do, by means of this legislation, the human and the godly thing of giving succor to those who are helpless, who stood by us in our hour of need, and whose principles are akin to ours, people who have been driven from their homes to temporary places of refuge, people who have suffered greatly and who, if they returned to their original homes, would be annihilated by those who are the enemies of our democracy no less than they are the enemies of these people themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered D, offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on the amendment lettered D, which has been offered by the Senator from Michigan.

As the bill now stands, it requires that at least 50 percent of the displaced persons admitted to the United States must come from countries which are classified as "annexed by a foreign power." Apparently that phrase refers to the three Baltic countries of Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and to the portion of what was formerly Poland, east of the Curzon line.

On the other hand, the amendment requires the issuance of visas to all racial groups, based on the proportion which they may bear to the total number of displaced persons in the so-called displaced persons camps in the three western zones of Germany, Austria, and Italy on January 1, 1948.

The purpose of the amendment is simple. It requires the selection on a proportional formula which would allow a cross section of all groups to be admitted into the United States.

Based on the latest compiled figures of the occupational authorities and the PCIRO, the numbers of such persons in the camps in these zones on the dates specified in the amendment are as follows:

Balts, 126,000, or 23 percent of the total population.

Jews, 163,000, or 25½ percent.

Poles, 266,000, or 42 percent.

Yugoslavs, 22,000, or 3½ percent.

Russians, 4,000, or one-half of 1 percent.

All others, 34,000, or 5½ percent.

A total of 635,000.

The Senate has just adopted the amendment of the Senator from Michigan which increases the number to be admitted from 100,000 to 200,000.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the figures and percentages the Senator from Massachusetts has just presented. Let me ask about the date on which they are based, and let me also ask whether that is one of the dates the Senator has in mind in connection with the determination of whether the persons who entered those zones shall be considered to be displaced persons.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These figures are based on the date January 1, 1948. My argument is based on the theory that the amendment which also is to be offered, which would change the date from December 1945 to April 21, 1947, will be adopted.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That was the purpose of my inquiry, because the estimates and figures given are not premised on the practice which existed until quite recently, when, under the Presidential directive, such persons were not considered to be displaced persons unless they had entered those zones prior to December 22, 1945.

So the Senator's estimates are based upon a recently extended date; namely, April 21, 1947.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was the date, as I understand, and as I think the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me, when General Clay closed the camps to further admissions of displaced persons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know what the date is based upon. But as a matter of fact, it is an extension by approximately a year and a half beyond the date fixed by the Presidential directive of December 22, 1945.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And it is premised upon an amendment to be offered later.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is not premised upon any of the terms of the committee bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is based on an amendment to be offered later, an amendment which the Senator from Massachusetts thought would be offered before this amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the total number of displaced persons to be admitted into the United States is 200,000, then under the amendment I am now discussing there could be admitted to the United States 46,000 Balts, 51,000 Jews, 84,000 Poles, 7,000 Yugoslavs, 1,000 Russians, and 11,000 persons from all other groups.

I wish to emphasize the point that our amendment simply fixes a ceiling in regard to the number of persons of each group who could be admitted. The amendment does not require that that number of persons be admitted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask the Senator about the figures he has presented. Who would be the persons who would be limited to 11,000 in number. From what nationality groups would they come?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The break-down by nationalities in connection with the group entitled "Others and unclassified" is based on a list consisting of the nationals of approximately 25 countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. For instance, Mr. President, would Czechoslovakia come within the group of 11,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They would come within that group.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, the people from Czechoslovakia would be included within that limited number and would have to share that number with the nationals of other countries; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. For instance, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden are among the countries included in the list.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator say that there are any people from Switzerland who are properly classified as displaced persons?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator that this is the classification which, as I understand, meets the classification used by the PCIRO for the classification of groups; and within the figure under the heading "Others," which is the term used to identify this group in the classification, are some of these countries. I do not for one moment say there are any Swiss in the displaced persons camps, but I say that Switzerland is included in this group, which is an international classification, I presume.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point I make is that the Senator now is proposing to change the immigration laws. He is not now dealing with displaced persons.

Let me ask the Senator whether citizens of Holland and of Denmark are included in the group to which he has referred.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Denmark is included in this list, and the Netherlands also is included. I do not say there are any displaced persons from those two countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just the point I make. There are no displaced persons from the Netherlands or from Denmark, both of which countries now have their own free governments reestablished. Likewise, there are no displaced persons from Switzerland. When the Senator from Massachusetts argues for a plan which would include the nationals of those countries, under a new bill, a bill dealing with a subject separate and apart from the displaced persons question, he is dealing with the immigration question, is he not, and not with the displaced-persons problem? I ask that question most respectfully.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say to the Senator from West Virginia, with equal respect, that this term, as I understand it, includes all the different classifications of nationals who may be in the displaced-persons camps. That does not necessarily mean that it will change the immigration quotas for various countries, when people from those countries are not in the displaced-persons camps.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But it does mean, does it not, that 11,000 persons are to be admitted, under the Senator's bill, under his break-down of the figures, and under the amendment, some of whom will come from Switzerland, some from Denmark, and some from the Netherlands? We know as a matter of fact that there is no such thing as a displaced person from those countries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just the point I want to make with respect to the bill as framed by the committee. There are some 10,000,000 displaced persons known as the Volksdeutsche, who are not covered by the bill. There are said to be some 10,000,000 in Pakistan. They are not only in Europe but in north Africa and the Middle East as well. The Senator is reaching out to include those who are not displaced persons, even in those categories. He is taking nationals of Switzerland and of the Netherlands and of Denmark, putting them into a displaced-persons bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most respectfully disagree with the statement just made by the Senator from West Virginia. What I tried to say was that there is an international classification, and if any DP is of one of those nationalities, he would come within that small group.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator prefaced his remarks, as I recall, by saying that if 200,000 are to be admitted there will be so many of one nationality and so many of another, and it then comes down to those who are unclassified, of which he said 11,000 would be admitted. He then mentioned the nationals of Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Denmark as being among those included within the 11,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I named those countries as being within the international classification. I did not say there were persons of those nationalities in displaced-persons camps.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Who is going to fill the ranks of the 11,000, if it is broken down to those countries, in which we know there are no displaced persons? I refer to Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Denmark.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator misunderstands the purpose of the amendment. The amendment simply makes use of the term "others" as one of the six classifications of displaced persons of whom 11,000 may be admitted.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe the interpretation of the amendment which has been suggested by my good friend the Senator from West Virginia is a correct interpretation and I think that a study of the provisions of the bill will bear out my statement. The amendment merely provides that any quota we fix for admission of "eligible displaced persons" shall be distributed among groups and nationalities as those groups and nationalities are designated by the International Refugee Organization.

The significant words are the words "Eligible displaced persons." Who are the eligible displaced persons described in S. 2242, which is the committee bill? They are not persons from the nations of which the Senator from West Virginia had spoken.

Section 2 of S. 2242 defines a displaced person in part as follows:

> (b) "Displaced person" means any displaced person or refugee as defined in annex I of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization and who is the concern of the International Refugee Organization.

Turning to annex I of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization we find that displaced persons must have been—

> (a) victims of the Nazi or Fascist regimes or of regimes which took part on their side in the Second World War.

I think the Senator would agree with me that the amendment simply provides a method of distributing the quota that will be admitted, and does not change the definition of "eligible displaced persons." The Senator's amendment certainly does not mean that people are to be brought in who have never been considered as displaced persons. The committee bill itself says that only those who are "eligible displaced persons" shall be admitted.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There are two definitions. One is a displaced person under the definition of the International Refugee Organization constitution. The other is what is known as an eligible displaced person, defined as one who may enter under this bill. To merely use the definition of a displaced person, as defined by the Organization, which definition the Senator has read, would result in the inclusion of people from all over the world, whose displacement was not the result of the Nazi persecutions, but which had occurred prior to the late war, and refugees of that class.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has nothing to do with the definition of eligible displaced persons. It does not change the definition contained in the bill in any way. It merely says that once the quota of eligible displaced persons has been filled, then they shall be distributed among all groups as named by the IRO. Nothing could be added to the definition of eligible displaced persons. That could not be changed. Only eligible displaced persons could be accepted, but they must be distributed according to groups and nationalities named by the IRO.

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

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the bill were unchanged, we would understand the meaning of eligible displaced persons. But remember, it is contemplated, and the Senator from Massachusetts has said he based his statement upon it, that by another amendment there will be extended the time limit within which persons may be considered for entry into this country as eligible displaced persons, changing the date from December 22, 1945 to April 21, 1947. The Senator from Massachusetts further stated, breaking down those figures, who they would be. If I mistake not, he said that of the total of 200,000, 11,000 were unclassified. He then named the countries coming within the nonclassified group. That is what I took up, pointing out that it would include Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Denmark. I wondered how he could consider any of the nationals of those countries as displaced persons.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator. I do not believe we could consider them, even if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Kentucky heard the Senator from Massachusetts make the statement that they are in the list.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator from West Virginia—and I know his thorough understanding of the bill—if he believes that the amendment, which goes merely to the distribution of those who are selected, could possibly result in bringing into this country any persons other than eligible displaced persons as defined in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, it could not, but the Senator will realize that a change in that definition is now being contemplated.

Mr. COOPER. I do not understand that it is being changed in any way by this amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not by this amendment; but did not the able Senator from Kentucky hear the able Senator from Massachusetts say that later he planned to offer an amendment which would change the definition?

Mr. COOPER. It would extend the time, but it would not change in any way the definition as far as it goes to the persons who could be considered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from West Virginia wish to say anything more on this subject?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to make one statement. It certainly would extend the classification of persons either by country or according to whether they had been displaced forcibly, whether they were known as infiltrees or refugees. It would certainly change the definition to that extent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to answer the question a little further, in order to make clear what I tried to say, that this classification merely includes persons who are in the displaced-persons

camps as listed by the PCIRO. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the statistical report on PCIRO operations, dated February 1948. That report shows the refugees receiving PCIRO care and maintenance on February 29, 1948, by PCIRO location, and by country of citizenship, as well as residence or ethnic group.

Those are the ones I have tried to point out are in the displaced persons camps.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator does not consider every refugee a displaced person, does he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky said, that this amendment does not enlarge the classification in any way, shape, or form. It merely makes a different quota from the quota submitted by the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would not the Senator's amendment, if agreed to, destroy the preference given to persons already in camps?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, is there anything in the Senator's amendment which would preserve the priority of persons who are in displaced-persons camps over those who are outside and living under the general economy of the country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not change it in any way at all; it merely would change the quotas, as submitted by the committee, and provide a different formula.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I invite the Senator's attention to that very point, because I am impressed with the thought that it would change the preference given by the committee's bill to displaced persons who are in camps.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully state that to the best of my knowledge it does not change the preference.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that our amendment simply fixes a ceiling on the number in each group that may be admitted. It does not require that the group be taken. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, one of the requirements for eligibility is that the displaced persons be qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for permanent residence.

Under the present language of the bill, without our amendment, two priorities must be met. First, 50 percent of the displaced persons must be from the three Baltic states or east of the Curzon line, which was formerly part of Poland, as their place of origin. That feature I have already briefly discussed.

Secondly, 50 percent must be farmers. Under the bill in its present form, both these priorities could be met by the same persons. In other words, a man who is a farmer and who comes from one of the three Baltic states or east of the Curzon line could be admitted and both priorities would be covered.

We must realize that the group from east of the Curzon line contains the largest percentage of farmers, 33 percent, or 44,500 in all. Only 7 percent of the Baltic group, or 11,000, and 4 percent of the Jewish group, or 6,500, are listed as farmers. Carrying this a step further, it simply means, under the administration of the proposed act as now written, these priorities could be covered by admitting 50,000 Poles and Balts from those areas. This would mean, logically, that the selection of the other 50,000 displaced persons to make up the total of 100,000, as originally in the bill, would be left entirely to discretion. This might mean that 50,000 of the 100,000 to be admitted under the bill might come from one racial group or could be arbitrarily apportioned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table which illustrates three possible hypothetical distributions.

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

Distribution of 100,000 immigrants under the bill as reported

	Possibility A, annexed areas and farmers	Possibility B	Possibility C
Balts	[1] 10,000	50,000	5,000
Jews	[2] 50,000		
Poles	[1] 40,000	50,000	45,000
Soviets			50,000
Yugoslavs			
Others			
Total	100,000	100,000	100,000

[1] Both priorities of 50 percent from annexed areas and 50 percent farmers can be met by taking 50,000 persons from annexed areas, leaving the remaining 50,000 to be distributed as the Federal officials see fit.

[2] Estimates of the number of Jewish displaced persons in camps on Dec. 22, 1945, and still there on Jan. 1, 1948, vary from 10,000 to 50,000. For the purposes of illustrating my point in this table, I am therefore taking the top figure of 50,000 Jewish displaced persons who could be eligible under the bill as it stands.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In short, the Commission could admit, we will say, 10,000 Balts and 40,000 Poles to cover the first two 50 percent priority requirements, and then could admit at its discretion 50 percent Jews. Another possibility could be 50,000 Balts, 50,000 Poles, and no Jews at all, or any combination of those three figures.

The purpose of our amendment is an effort to give all segments of these unsettled peoples a fair break. It would also place definite, fixed ceilings on the number in each group that could be admitted.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand the Senator's remarks, a man or a woman of German ethnic origin could still continue to be barred from this country. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is as I understand, because persons belonging to the German ethnic group are not considered to be displaced persons, so far.

Mr. LANGER. Under the definition of the PCIRO?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what I understand.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think that is right?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think it is the most practical definition, I would say to the Senator, that we can adopt at the present time.

Mr. LANGER. Knowing the Senator from Massachusetts as I do, I have always thought that he was opposed to discrimination of any kind or character.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope I am.

Mr. LANGER. Why, then, should we discriminate against men or women of German ethnic origin?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I believe we should do at the present time is to try to solve the problem of displaced persons in camps. They are now a great responsibility. They are a continuing responsibility, and unless we take steps to end the situation it will grow worse and worse. This amendment is a step in the right direction.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator not know that the investigation by the Judiciary Committee disclosed that approximately 1,323,000 so-called displaced persons are not in camps, not behind barbed wire, but are going around the same as anyone else?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been to four displaced-persons camps. I know that there are no bars, no gates, or anything of that kind, and the people are free to move in the community.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator realize that ten million or more persons of German ethnic origin are in desperate condition in Europe, are much worse off than the so-called displaced persons, and that, as a matter of fact, four or five millions of them have already died?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer the Senator's question from factual knowledge, and I cannot make comparisons. I saw many people who I thought were extremely hungry and were very badly clothed. Whether they were worse off or better off than some other group I would not be competent to say.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to thank the Senator, and I hope I am not interrupting him too much. In the written amendment which the Senator has offered I believe the language has reference to such elements or groups as are selected or designated for the purpose of being cared for by the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948. Would there not be some conflict?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We took that part of the amendment from the Senator's own bill, on line 16, page 4, and we did not change it at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mean to say that he took that language from the committee bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no. My amendment does not strike out the language in the bill which runs from line 14 on page 4 to line 22 on page 4. It merely strikes out the language from line 10 to line 14.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point I am making is that the Senator in the written language of his amendment uses the date January 1, 1948.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the language used in the pending bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the committee bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Where?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On page 4, line 16. I will quote those two lines to the Senator:

> Priority in the issuance of visas shall be given to those eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who were on January 1, 1948, located in displaced persons camps and centers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Located in displaced persons camps, but not as segregated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like also to call the Senator's attention to what the Senator from New Jersey has just reminded me, namely, that the same date is used in the committee bill on page 2, line 7.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was used as to those in camps on January 1, 1948, but in the Senator's amendment it is said, "in the proportion that the number of displaced persons in such element or group bears to the total number of displaced persons as of January 1, 1948." There is a great difference between using the date January 1, 1948, as to those who were in camps on that date and then using it as in the Senator's amendment, as to the proportions they bore to each group.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My understanding is that these camps were closed by General Clay on April 21, 1947. Between that date and January 1, 1948, some of the DP's went out of the camps. For instance, as the Senator himself said, some went to Belgium, some to England, and some elsewhere. As I understand the purpose of the amendment and what we are asked to do, is to take the number of persons who were in these camps on January 1, 1948, and give them quotas based on the percentage of population.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has again stated the date of April 21, 1947, as the date when General Clay closed the entries into the camps. I know that is correct, under an order that was entered when the Army had charge of the camps. There were very definite exceptions made called hardship cases, and I believe the Senator will find upon inquiry that thousands have come in. In other words, it has been said that as soon as one group goes out others come in. Since July 1, 1947, General Clay has not had control of these camps, and it is regrettable that he has not had. It is under the PCIRO. The old UNRRA group is running them. The camp teams are former UNRRA employees. I say that it is regrettable, because I saw two camps which continued to be operated by the Army, and it is regrettable for the people who lived in the camps that the Army ever gave up control of any of them.

Be that as it may, when the Senator says that General Clay closed the camps on April 21, 1947, I think the Senator will find upon inquiry, and find it very readily, that the gates of those camps are still open to people who desire to enter them. It has been said time and again that as people go out others come in.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I visited four of those camps. I think I visited two of them, either in the Senator's company or just after he did. I know, as he knows, that some of them are in much better shape than others, and I know, as he knows, that the discipline in some of them is much better than in others. Unquestionably some people have filtered in illegally, just as they filter in illegally anywhere. But I do not think that was done to such an extent that it is unfair to base these quotas on the number who were in the camps on January 1, 1948.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has spoken of the infiltrees, that is, the people who have come in.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said filtered in illegally.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Some illegally and some legally.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They all have come in illegally, have they not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. There are what are called "hardship cases" which the authorities let in, and I find that is a very broad term in the camps. If people are hungry, of course, they are hardship cases. But they are there.

The Senator has mentioned a word which I am very glad he did, namely, "infiltree." Under the Senator's amendment he is going to give some preference of consideration to infiltrees and refugees who came in a long time after the war as against the real displaced person who was forced out of his country and compelled to work by the Nazi Government. The Senator is putting them on the same level.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I answer the Senator from West Virginia in this way: We have to look at this problem, as at all other problems resulting from the war, as optimistically as we can, first, in the interest of the United States; second, in the interest of humanity; third, in the interest of justice. I agree with the Senator that more people have infiltrated into the camps, but even if they have, if we are to act on the displaced persons problem in the camps, we have to make a start, we have to use some date as a basis on which to figure quotas.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Using the excellent formula just expressed, of justice and fairness——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I place first what is for the best interest of the United States; second, humanity; and third, justice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Using that good formula, and knowing that we cannot take them all, and are not attempting to take them all—and I am sure that the Senator does not insist that we take all those who may be in displaced persons camps——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator think it meets the interests of the country, certainly meets the high standards of humanity, and meets the high standards of justice, if we take those people who cannot return home, and who were forced out as laborers, who have been longest in the camps, and give them a little preference over those who since the war was over, and even up to this time, have come over the borders into the American zone? Does not the Senator think there should be a preference given, and does it not meet the standards of humanity and justice to give that preference?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from West Virginia will bear with me for 2 or 3 minutes, perhaps I shall be able to answer his question satisfactorily, and completely convince him, I hope, that he is wrong.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota whether he is going to speak on the pending amendment. I should like to have a chance to have a vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. LANGER. There is no chance to reach a vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator any idea how long we would have to remain in session?

Mr. LANGER. I expect to speak for several hours.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire of the Senator from West Virginia whether he is disposed to make a prediction as to whether we might get a vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not see any reasonable chance for a vote on the amendment tonight, no.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course we want to comply with the requests of all Senators. I had hoped we might at least get this one amendment out of the way.

Let me inquire of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether he is going to speak on the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my intention.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know of any other Senator on his side of the aisle who would like to speak on it?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that we are attempting to come to a conclusion of the pending legislation, I wonder if the proponents and opponents would be ready to consider a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on all amendments and the bill on next Tuesday, let us say. I do not care to advance the request before the group of distinguished Senators who are interested primarily in the subject, especially the members of the committee, feel that the debate may be nearing a conclusion. I will ask the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from West Virginia whether they consider it would be of any service to submit a unanimous-consent request tonight that a vote be taken on the amendment sometime next Tuesday?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not think it would do any good.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the Senator from West Virginia say?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I would say that such a request made at the present time would not be worth while. There are some 16 or 17 amendments yet to be considered. I think at this point in the procedure it is hardly worth while to make the request for the purpose stated by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wanted to say that while I think everyone has cooperated in trying to secure the passage of the bill, I must call attention to the fact that, although it has been or is supposed to have been the unfinished business for some time, it has, from time to time, been set aside for consideration of other matters, and now, according to the acting majority leader, we will be compelled to put further consideration of it over from today until Tuesday. It has been said that after the matter which will be taken up tomorrow is concluded, it is proposed to proceed to consider an appropriation bill. So it will be at least Tuesday before we can again return to consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. Then, if two or three more days are consumed as might very well happen, by legitimate debate, and other appropriation bills should be taken up, the time when action on this measure can be had is hardly in sight.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico in pointing out the possible situation. In defense of Senators who have the pending bill in charge I may say that the Senate has been obliged from time to time to lay it aside temporarily and take up other matters, as all Senators know. That has been most disconcerting. It is difficult to come back to the consideration of a bill which has been interrupted from time to time. I think there are 16 amendments yet to be acted upon, but I thought that possibly we might secure a vote on most of the committee amendments.

In line with the idea set forth by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, may I ask whether those in charge of the bill, as well as its opponents, would be agreeable to setting an hour, let us say on next Wednesday, when we might vote on the amendments then pending, and on final passage of the bill? I believe that if we can agree upon some hour we can secure quick action upon the bill. We must consider the schedule for next week. It is proposed that we consider the draft legislation, and it would be well, if we can do so, to take it up before adjourning from tomorrow until next Tuesday. I appeal to those in charge of the bill to entertain a unanimous consent request at least to vote at an hour on Wednesday of next week which is agreeable to them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator, if he is addressing the question to me——

Mr. WHERRY. I am addressing it to all Senators interested in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that I desire to cooperate. For more than a week now, from time to time, other business has been taken up, while the bill which is now before the Senate has been laid aside. The leadership has told me from time to time how important it has been to proceed with other matters. Tomorrow two subjects are to be taken up, for which the pending bill is to be set aside. I do not think it is proper at this time even to consider any future hour at which a vote shall be taken.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps it is best not to press for an agreement at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, the Senator from Massachusetts has the floor. If he will permit me, I will say we shall certainly continue in session today until he has completed his speech. We shall do as much as we can tonight. But I feel that the Members of the Senate should be advised of the situation so they may judge what we shall have to do, not only during the remainder of today, but on next Tuesday and next Wednesday.

Mr. President, in order properly to apportion the time for the remainder of the session, if we are to adjourn on June 19 we must have some idea of when the major pieces of legislation shall be brought up. I had hoped that if the pending bill had to be carried over until next week we might at least fix some hour on next Tuesday or next Wednesday when we might vote on the amendments then pending and on final passage of the bill. I do not want to press the distinguished Senator from West Virginia any further. We have laid aside the bill several times, and, as I previously said, that has been disconcerting to all of us.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish only to make a facetious remark, which it is not necessary to make; but I will say that if we continue to act as we have on this proposed legislation, I shall suggest that the title of the bill be amended to read "The displaced bill relating to displaced persons."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is in charge of the various amendments we have offered, and I say with assurance that I speak his mind, that the proponents of the amendments will be glad to vote on them at any time, and will be glad to make any reasonable agreement as to when to vote.

Mr. WHERRY. May I again propound to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia the question whether he would consider a unanimous-consent request, in view of the attitude of the proponents of the amendments, relative to the time, either on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, or any other day next week, when a vote might be had.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the able Senator that I have tried to make myself quite clear and to be fair on the subject. I do not want to enter into any agreement at this time, in view of the number of amendments pending, and those which will be proposed, as I am advised.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The proponents of the amendments have consumed practically all of the time that has been spent on the bill. The opponents have not had opportunity to avail themselves of much time on them.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not in any way condemning or condoning. I am simply trying to expedite the legislation. We have been very successful, I believe, in the legislative program so far this year, and the only way to secure a unanimous-consent agreement is to submit it. I have done my level best. I am inclined to believe that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has gone as far as he can go. So at an appropriate time I shall again submit a unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Nebraska has spoken of the large amount of legislation which lies ahead of us, and particularly the work which will come before us during the next week. I call attention to the fact that General MacArthur will be here next week. That will take additional time of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I heard a statement made to that effect. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for reminding the Senate that General MacArthur is expected to return here next week.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. IVES. It is not quite clear in the mind of the Senator from New York whether we are to have more votes tonight on amendments. I should like to have that point made clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe I speak the view of the Senator from Nebraska when I say that when the Senator from Massachusetts has concluded his remarks, which will require about 5 minutes if he is not interrupted, nothing further will be done by way of voting tonight. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. WHERRY. As I said before, I have been very optimistic that we could secure a vote but when the Senator from Massachusetts has concluded his speech tonight, and when he has engaged in colloquy with other Senators, or answered questions they may desire to ask of him, it will be my purpose to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the purpose of our amendment is to give all segments of these unsettled peoples a fair break. It would also place definite fixed ceilings on the numbers of each group who could be admitted. Under our amendment we will know within close limits exactly the racial groups that we may expect. We do not have that knowledge under the bill as it now stands because the Commission may well have a free rein in the selection of one-half of the total number to be admitted.

Under the present language of the bill, two groups, it seems to me, are not treated fairly. There are few farmers among the Jews—only about 4 percent and only a small percentage of them originated from areas now considered by the bill as annexed areas.

Moreover, there is a group of the Roman Catholic faith who come from west of the Curzon line, and these could not be admitted in fair numbers since preference is given to the Baltic states, where the Protestant faith is in the majority.

It seems to me that an equitable opportunity for resettlement must be given to all groups and elements. It is a much more practical approach. In the United States today there are racial groups similar to those represented among these displaced persons. Their origins are in the same areas. Their nationalities are the same. These citizens of ours have a particular concern and interest in their corresponding groups in the displaced persons' camps. If we are desirous of having a wide distribution of these people throughout our land, their distribution, as well as their rehabilitation, will, in large measure, be dependent upon the assistance of local citizens, communities, and agencies. Local volunteers among our citizens must be enthusiastic if this program is to be successful. If those admitted are equitably chosen on a percentage basis then we shall have a better chance to stimulate the required support and the coordinated efforts of all local, State and national groups.

Let me now point out one fact which I believe the committee has not considered carefully enough. The present bill uses the words whose place of origin or country of nationality has been annexed by a foreign power. In this country today we have representatives of the former independent states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Our Government has clearly refused to admit that those countries have been annexed. While it is obvious that the Soviet Union is at present exercising sovereignty over those countries, our country does not recognize that fact. Therefore, it seems to me to be embarrassing not only to their representatives in this country, but to us as a Nation to designate the displaced persons of those nationalities as coming from a country which has been annexed to a foreign power until that fact has been officially recognized by our Government.

I am not a member of the Judiciary Committee, but my interest in this subject comes from the simple fact that there are many people not only in Massachusetts, but in every other State in the Union, who are vitally interested in this humanitarian problem. Because of their interest and because of the great human problem involved, I have tried to understand this question and to help in any way that I could. Last autumn I visited some of these camps. I have talked with officers of our Armed Forces who have been in charge of them. I believe that there are many persons who will become valuable citizens among the displaced persons at the present time. I recognize, as we all do, that there are some who could not properly and helpfully be brought to this country. That hard core, as it is called, will be a problem of the United Nations or some other international group for many years to come, but that hard core should be made as small as it is reasonable to make it.

Our purpose in passing this bill is to have the United States undertake its share of responsibility in this great international program caused by the war. Certainly any admissions that we make should be scrutinized carefully. They should not be permitted to displace our citizens from homes or from positions, but today there are positions on the farms and in industries where these people can qualify and where they are needed. I hope sincerely that their number may be increased from 100,000 to 200,000—this has already been done—and that they may be brought in on a basis that is equitable to all who are now in the camps, rather than on a basis which could leave the solution largely to the discretion of an administering agency.

Every Member of the Senate has citizens in his constituency from these nationalities of whom they are proud. These people are proud of their descent. They have a love of their former homeland. They will be glad to help restore to greater security and give greater opportunity to qualified persons who have for many years suffered so much and who have had so little chance to enjoy the ordinary decencies of life which we take as a matter of course.

I hope, Mr. President, that in due course this amendment may be adopted and that a fair bill may be passed.

Mr. President, I should like to add one further comment. The Senator from West Virginia questioned me as to whether there were any citizens of Danish descent in the DP camps. I have checked up with the Army representative on the question of DP camps, and he states over the telephone that there are Danes married to DP's, and that those married persons are in the camps. So I answer the question in that way.

Mr. President, I hope the bill may ultimately become law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was the plan of those sponsoring these amendments that I should follow at this time in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I shall not do so today because of the lateness of the hour. However, I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his able presentation of our point of view on this amendment. There is very little that I can add, but I shall do it when we resume debate on this subject by way of supplementing what the Senator from Massachusetts has said.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a petition which I have received upon the subject of displaced persons, including the names signed thereto.

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

MAY 15, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned, representing many millions of American citizens, call upon the Congress to enact at the earliest possible date legislation authorizing entry into the United States of a just proportion of the displaced persons.

We are heartened that the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported favorably a bill, S. 2242, dealing with this subject. However, it is our sincere conviction that S. 2242 in its present form does not offer an adequate solution to the problem and that it discriminates against great masses of the displaced persons.

Our organizations have consistently advocated the admission of 100,000 displaced persons a year over a 4-year period. We still hope that this may prove possible. At the very least, we ask you to support such amendments to S. 2242 as will enable the United States to admit 200,000 displaced persons over a 2-year period and a proportionate cross-section of such persons without discrimination as to national origin or religious faith.

We believe that this is the minimum that the United States can and should do in order to discharge its responsibility as a leading world power and as the traditional haven for those oppressed by the tyrannies of other lands.

Respectfully,

Roger N. Baldwin, American Civil Liberties Union; Maurice Bisgyer, Executive Secretary, B'nai B'rith; Mrs. J. D. Bragg, President, Women's Division of Christian Service, the Methodist Church; Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Mrs. Alfred Chapman, Chairman, National Executive Board, Women's Auxiliary National Council of Protestant Churches; Edward Corsi, President, American Federation of International Institutes; Mrs. Stanley G. Cook, Chairman on Legislation, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Nathan Cowan, Legislative Director, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Mary Margaret Mannix, President, National Council of Catholic Women; Mark Dauber, Executive Secretary, Home Missions Council of North America; Miss Mary C. Duffy, Supreme Regent, Catholic Daughters of America; William G. Gadt, President, National Lutheran Council; Ray Gibbons, Director, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches; Rev. L. W. Goebel, D. D., President, Evangelical and Reform Church; Leon Henderson, Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action; Paul Howard, Director, National Relations Office, American Library Association; Miss Helen G. Irwin, Legislative Chairman, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; Mrs. Jonas W. Irwin, Washington Representative, National Board, Y. W. C. A. of U. S. A.; Read Lewis, Executive Director, Common Council for American Unity; Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Kirtley S. Mather, President, Eugene E. Barnett, General Secretary, National Council of YMCA; Dr. William G. Mather, Chairman, Northern Baptist Convention, Council on Christian Social Progress; John McDowell, Executive Director, National Federation of Settlements; Mrs. Lucy Milligan, President, National Council of Women; Tom R. Owens, Legislative Representative, United Rubber Workers; Chat Paterson, National Chairman, American Veterans Committee; James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union; Rev. Almon R. Pepper, Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Social Relations, National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches; Leslie S. Perry, Washington Representative, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Dr. Paul N. Poling, Secretary, Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church of

the U. S. A.; Jacob S. Potofsky, President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Joseph M. Proskauer, President, American Jewish Committee; Esther A. Richards, Secretary, Universalist Church of America; Abraham Rockmore, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; Mrs. Rose Rohman, President, National Catholic Women's Union; Lessing J. Rosenwald, President, American Council for Judaism; Philip Schiff, National Jewish Welfare Board; Rose Schneiderman, President, National Women's Trade Union League; Mrs. Annalee Stewart, President, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Anna Lord Strauss, President, League of Women Voters of the U. S.; Marjorie L. Temple, Legislative Program Associate, American Association of University Women; Mrs. Theodore Wedel, Chairman, Department of Christian Social Relations, United Council of Church Women; Bernard Weitzer, National Legislative Representative, Jewish War Veterans; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Mrs. Norman De R. Whitehouse, Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace; Ray Wilson, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Dr. Stephen S. Wise, President, American Jewish Congress.

PROPOSED BUREAU OF ASYLUMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take 2 or 3 minutes to comment on an entirely different subject. I make these comments on the basis of my conviction that confession is good for the soul.

I direct my remarks to a bill which I introduced on May 20, Senate bill 2711, having to do with Federal inspection of mental hospitals in instances in which State hospitals receive funds by way of Federal aid.

I introduced this bill as a matter of courtesy to a group which has been working long and hard on the general problem of seeking to improve the administration of mental hospitals and the care of patients therein. It was my understanding that the bill had been checked with counsel. In the rush of events which is the experience of every Member of the Senate, I myself did not take the time to analyze the bill. However, I made it clear to those who asked me to introduce it that I would do so only as an act of courtesy. Frequently we introduce legislation which does not necessarily carry with it our endorsement as individual Senators. I frankly confess for the record that I had not analyzed the draftsmanship of the bill. My attention was called to an obvious error or two in the draftsmanship, so I sent the bill to the legislative counsel and asked for a review of it, only to find that my office had previously asked for the opinion of the legislative counsel, which I had not seen, but which was sent to me under date of April 8.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from a memorandum which I received from the legislative counsel on Senate bill 2711.

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

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR MORSE

This is in reply to your request for our opinion on the request of Miss Friedman that you sponsor legislation establishing a Federal Bureau of Asylums.

As you know, Congress has no authority under the Constitution to legislate over matters which are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the States and State insane asylums fall within that exclusive State jurisdiction.

The only way the Federal Government can exercise control over State asylums is by a constitutional amendment, except that some limited control could be exercised where Congress appropriates money to the States to help maintain and operate State asylums with a condition that the States must agree to certain Federal controls or else they would not get the money. This type of control is subject to two possible practical objections:

First, many Members of Congress object to imposing indirect controls on the States as a condition precedent to receiving necessary Federal aid.

Second, unless the amount of the appropriation is very large, it is doubtful that the States would be induced to submit to the Federal controls suggested by Miss Friedman.

It would seem to this writer, who admittedly has no expert knowledge of the conditions existing in State insane asylums, that in a matter of this kind which is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the several States, the proper procedure to be followed in improving the conditions that are alleged to exist today would be through the State governors or the State legislatures.

Respectfully yours,

S. E. RICE.

APRIL 8, 1948.

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion the bill as originally introduced would not meet constitutional tests. I so discovered upon my examination of the bill subsequent to its introduction. Therefore, I am submitting a redraft of the bill today, though I am not endorsing even the redraft. However, the redraft, I believe, at least eliminates the unconstitutional feature of the bill as originally introduced.

I wish the RECORD clearly to show that my only interest in this matter is to use the bill as a courtesy vehicle for calling to the attention of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the need and importance of the committee proceeding in the next session of Congress to look into the whole question of the relationship between the Federal Government and mental hospitals which receive any Federal funds whatsoever.

I am in sympathy with the general objectives of the bill, but I want the RECORD to show that I am serving clear notice on my colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that I am satisfied that the bill will require complete redrafting and revision, possibly by way of a committee bill, after the necessary investigations are made by the committee. I believe that such investigations will have to be made by any committee which studies the subject matter of the bill.

I do not need to tell the Senate that the treatment of mental patients in this country and the inadequate support which is given to mental hospitals generally is not a pleasant record for Americans who take the time to ascertain the facts. The amount of mental illness in the United States is very large, and I am afraid that many of us who enjoy good health are quite guilty of oversight of the thousands of our more unfortunate brethren who find themselves in mental hospitals and in some instances in hospitals where it would be more appropriate to refer to their status as that of incarceration, rather than that of sick persons being treated as patients.

I recognize that the Federal Government cannot and should not take over the jurisdiction of the treatment of mental patients. I am as much opposed to Federal administration of hospitals involving the mental sick as I am opposed to Federal administration and control of so-called general hospitals involving patients ill with other types of sickness. Yet I think we need to recognize that in some parts of the United States we could quite legitimately and properly supply Federal aid to some State hospitals, so as to eliminate some of the very undesirable conditions which exist in many of the mental hospitals. In fact, I think it is proper to say that the year 1700 is quite an appropriate year to cite by way of comparison in describing the treatment which exists in some sections of the United States, so far as mental patients are concerned. In many parts of our country we have not progressed very far beyond 1700 in the treatment of mental patients.

So, Mr. President, I think it is quite proper for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have this bill on file and to give it some notice before adjournment. I hope at least we can work out in the committee an understanding that in the next session of Congress, when a perfected bill is introduced—and I shall be glad to introduce a perfected bill—we can then proceed with the consideration of the general problem of Federal aid to mental hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 2711) to amend the Public Health Service Act, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 538, second session, to establish a Federal Bureau of Asylums for inspections of all institutions which obtain Federal grants of money, and which are caring for mental patients, was received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with this subject, I wish to point out that in the United States there are many sincere groups who are working on this matter because they are greatly disturbed over the very unfortunate, and in some instances disgraceful, conditions which exist in some of our mental hospitals.

So, Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD at this point certain communications which I have received from a gentleman by the name of Arthur J. Gross, who has been very active in this matter. Again I point out that he has proposals which I do not necessarily endorse, but he does have suggestions which I think are deserving of consideration by an appropriate committee of the Senate.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with your suggestion when I talked with you at

the Capitol, I submit information to you on S. 2711.

The bill is loosely drawn with many parts open to criticism by opponents.

1. As (1) reads it would include veteran and other Government hospitals which do not come under the provisions of the National Mental Health Act.

2. Section 3, the Federal Bureau of Asylums should not be under the jurisdiction of a member of the Cabinet or joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives because the first part places the Bureau in a political plane and because of changes of Cabinet officers there would be uncertainties in the Bureau from time to time.

3. Section 3 is too restricted and possibly unconstitutional because of restriction of age and the barring of men within the medical and legal professions.

In my experience in legislative work, I have found that the simpler the bill is the better chance it has of enactment. S. 2711 gives opponents too many things to find fault with, thus defeating the purpose of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GROSS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 22, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the courtesy extended to me on yesterday when I talked with you with reference to an amendment to the National Mental Health Act.

The purpose of the amendment is threefold, namely, to protect the United States Government and the taxpayers in unsupervised spending of money by private and State hospitals who may obtain money under the act.

As the act reads, nothing is done to reach the root of the trouble that is facing this country with regard to mental illness, and its treatment, except in research work. The Rockefeller Foundation and others interested in the above subject have spent large sums of money in the past without obtaining the results that are desired. Too much money was wasted in giving jobs to psychiatrists, students of psychiatry, social workers, clerks, and other administrative expenses, in carrying on the research work. At no time did those recipients do the most important thing, namely, consider the welfare of the inmate in the State hospital. No consideration was given to the fact that most victims of mental illness become such through social problems and not through physical conditions.

Real high-type psychoanalysts and psychiatrists recognize the above to be the fact. Recently in the United States religion has stepped into the picture and is doing some constructive work in giving the mentally ill some hope and peace of mind. A good example of this is the book written by Rabbi Joshua Liebman, of Boston—Peace of Mind—which was a best seller for months.

The third element is the State hospital employee. Unfortunately, due to the low-wage scale, treatment of employees, and lack of civil-service protection in most States, State and private mental hospitals have been unable to obtain the caliber of employee that is fitted for work in mental hospitals. Attendants in most cases are alcoholics; drifters, going from one hospital to another; homosexualists, or failures in life. Because of the type of work that is required of an attendant, very few high-type employees are attracted to the work of an attendant. In many State hospitals, superintendents of the old school are czars, running the institutions as their private enterprises, and with disregard for the old, antiquated laws pertaining to commitment, constitutional rights of inmates and employees.

Many superintendents and psychiatrists in these hospitals have had no experience in the private practice of psychosomatic medicine and have been living on taxpayers ever since they came out of medical schools.

Public-spirited young doctors merely stay in a mental hospital as an intern or resident physician long enough to get some experience in psychiatry and then leave to go into private practice or go to another hospital and obtain a better position. Many of these young doctors get only between 3 months to a year of experience. The unscrupulous doctor—after such short period of training—assumes the role of an expert in mental diseases and preys on the public, who in the past 5 years have been overconscious about mental illness through the dangerous amount of publicity the country has been flooded with in books, magazine articles, plays, movies, and newspaper stories.

Inmates in State hospitals also are suffering because of the lack of high-grade experienced psychiatrists. Recently I found in one of the State hospitals where two young doctors, who were merely learning something about psychiatry, covering the male psychiatric service of over 1,000 patients. It is humanly impossible for doctors under such circumstances to do justice to their work and to the inmate. He cannot properly prepare his report on new admissions, which report is the basis for diagnosis and record of the inmate, which record he is judged by at the staff hearing, reports to relatives and testimony in court proceedings, involving the inmate and his property.

Let me also bring to your attention the fact that each State has its own insanity laws governing State hospitals. These laws vary, are old, antiquated, and inhuman. They, in many cases, have not been changed in over a hundred years in many respects. The laws in many instances have been lobbied through the State legislature by the medical profession and in its interest only, without regard for the victim of mental illness or illegal commitment, and utter disregard for the taxpayer, who foots the bills in supporting the State mental hospitals. I am working on a uniform Federal insanity law which will be ready for the next session of Congress.

For your information, I have sent copies of the amendment I have written and of which you have a copy, to about a hundred Members of Congress. I also am sending a letter, dated May 18, 1948, similar to the one you received, to labor and veterans' organizations, since there are thousands of members of organized labor in State and private mental hospitals. As for veterans, it is needless for me to inform you that there are thousands in State hospitals because of the lack of beds in veterans mental hospitals. These veterans are not getting the care and treatment in the State hospitals that they receive in veterans hospitals, or as intended by the Congress—and the Veterans' Administration. The State hospitals receive large sums of money for the care of the veterans in their hospitals, and do not give value for these payments. Even a meager investigation will disclose this.

May I also suggest that a congressional committee investigation be made of State and private mental hospitals. It will disclose hair-raising evidence of mismanagement, cruelty, underfeeding, underclothing, and slave labor in the guise of occupational therapy.

I am writing you another letter as suggested by you with reference to S. 2711, Eightieth Congress, second session, the bill you filed on May 20, 1948.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GROSS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 18, 1948.*

A very grave problem faces this country, far more serious than is realized. The problem is the mental health of our people.

Due to the fact that there has been a dangerous amount of publicity concerning mental disease through books, magazine articles, plays, movies, and newspaper stories, the public has become over-conscious concerning their mental condition. They have been running to psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, and psychologists with their problems. Because mental diseases and psychiatry (the medical term for that part of the medical professional) is the infant of the medical profession and an inexact science, unscrupulous doctors, and psychologists have been bleeding the public with fees far beyond the value of their services. Because of old and antiquated State laws on insanity and commitments, thousands of people have been committed to State and private mental hospitals without trial and without due process of law, through the activities of unscrupulous doctors posing as mental exports, police, officials of cities and towns and relatives of the victims. Once in these hospitals, the victim loses every right guaranteed him by our Constitution. He, in most hospitals, is treated worse than a criminal in jail or in a penitentiary.

No one knows when he might be a victim himself. Over half the beds in hospitals in this country are occupied by mental patients, this is exclusive of Government hospitals.

The Congress of the United States in its effort to remedy the conditions enacted the National Mental Health law. This law will, no doubt, help the situation in the future. However, under the law, a blank check is given to State and private hospitals.

In order to protect the Government against waste of money and to protect the inmates in the mental hospitals, I have drawn an amendment to the act. I am enclosing herewith for your information a copy of the amendment which will be filed in the Senate and House of Representatives.

At a hearing before the appropriate congressional committees, I will appear with citizens and representatives of organizations who have for years been fighting the illegal commitment racket and conditions in the State and private hospitals.

Should you care to discuss this amendment with me, I will be more than happy to do so.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR J. GROSS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last of all I introduce, as a matter of courtesy to Mr. Gross, and for reference to the committee for such study and consideration and investigation as the committee in due course of time may wish to give to it, a bill which he proposes, dealing with a similar subject, but in many respects different from the bill which the other group asked me to introduce on May 10, and which I have submitted in revised form today, as a revised bill. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce this bill on the same subject matter, for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2765) to amend the Public Health Service Act, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 538, second session, to provide for Federal inspection of institutions, State mental health authorities, and hospitals who obtain grants of money, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, some of us have been discussing the unfortunate situation into which we are getting in the consideration of legislation, and about which the Senator from Nebraska has frequently spoken. It seems that unavoidably the displaced persons bill will go over until next week. If debate on it is continued, as apparently it will be, it is not now possible to determine when final action will be had on this measure, especially in view of the fact that next week, after we take up the bill again, again, and again, and again, it may be displaced for the consideration of other proposed legislation.

With that thought in mind, and with the utmost desire to be cooperative, I wish to suggest now to the acting majority leader that he give serious consideration that when we take up this bill again, we proceed with it until action on it is finished, and that if necessary we have night sessions, and that all Members of the Senate be notified that that course will be necesasry. It is not desirable; I do not want it; I do not like night sessions; but I do not see how they can be avoided.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the observations which have been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. In view of his observations, let me say for the RECORD that, as he well knows, the conference report on the Bulwinkle bill is a privileged matter, and consideration of it could not be foreclosed when the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] asked that it be laid before the Senate. In order to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, as the Senator recalls, unanimous consent was had whereby the consideration of the conference report on the Bulwinkle bill will be delayed until Friday of this week.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico also knows, because of his long experience in the Senate, that prompt consideration of appropriation bills is, of course, most important as they come along.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I began my remarks with a statement which perhaps the Senator from Nebraska did not hear, inasmuch as he may have been engaged in conversation. I said that what I was saying was not critical at all——

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. HATCH. But I simply realize the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that. I was just reaching the point, after referring to the background, of not only commending the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his remarks but of commenting on how we may act on his suggestion in order to bring about what he has suggested.

Mr. President, the displacement of the displaced persons bill has been somewhat disconcerting to all of us. For the RECORD, I wish to call attention once again to the fact that tomorrow, Friday, when the Senate convenes, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the conference report on the so-called Bulwinkle bill will come before the Senate. The time assigned for the debate on it is from 12 o'clock to 3:30 p. m. At that time a vote will be taken.

In view of the fact that the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, to which I referred to a moment ago, is ready, and that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has attempted to have it considered at various times during the last 3 or 4 days, I feel that at that time it will be best, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, to have the Senate take up that bill and conclude action on it.

Then, for the benefit of the RECORD and the Senators now present, I wish to say that it is my intention to bring up the proposed legislation relative to the Second War Powers Act. I think that measure can be disposed of with very little debate.

If action on all those measures is concluded tomorrow, so that we may return to the displaced persons' bill before the Senate adjourns tomorrow, then we shall be back on the unfinished business.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I agree with his suggestion 100 percent. But in order that all Senators may have a chance, once again, to have measures on the Consent Calendar acted upon, I think that if it meets with the approval of the Senate, we shall have the Senate adjourn on Friday until Tuesday. That will give the Senate a morning hour on Tuesday, and will provide an opportunity for going back to the beginning of the calendar for the consideration of all bills on the calendar, so that if there are bills as to which there is agreement, they can be disposed of. The morning hour will be concluded at 1 o'clock on Tuesday, because during all of next week, as has already been announced, the Senate will meet at 11 a. m. and will continue until 6 p. m.

So, Mr. President, beginning with next Tuesday, June 1, the Senate will again return to the unfinished business, the displaced persons bill. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that at that time it should not be displaced until action on it is concluded. But the appropriation bills and conference reports, as the Senator well knows, are privileged, as was action on the veto message. I certainly agree with the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico. They are very timely.

With the announcement I have made for the RECORD, outlining the program for tomorrow and the proposed adjournment over until Tuesday, the morning hour, the calling of the calendar, and the resumption of the consideration of the displaced-persons bill at 1 o'clock, June 1, I think we have outlined the program for the immediate future as far as possible. I may say it is our intention when the displaced-persons legislation is concluded to make the draft bill the unfinished business. Following that, we shall have to determine from day to day what legislation is to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The so-called displaced persons bill is still before the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if no Senator desires to take the floor to discuss the pending bill or to bring up other matters, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, Friday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 20), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

Philip C. Jessup, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America, with the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, in the Security Council of the United Nations.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska. (Mr. Arend is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 20), 1948:

Mrs. Helen Jaeger to be postmaster at Independence, in the State of Kentucky.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1948

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

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of love, who came to this world not to be ministered unto, but to minister, help us to give our services wholly to Thee and our fellow men; help us to seek by understanding, rather than by striving, to promote concord and harmony among all conditions of men.

O God, grant that this erring, groping day, with its baffled ignorance and sin, with its oppression and misery, may soon vanish and cease to hide Thee behind its wicked works. Open our minds that we may feel the breath of the overcoming spirit of the Christ, who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

We pray for all upon whom rest the business, political, and industrial life of our country; in all their ways may they acknowledge Thee. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 25, 1948:

H. R. 1878. An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to United States of aliens who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States;

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes.

On May 26, 1948:

H. R. 5298. An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MURRAY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2277) entitled "An act to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a telegram and in the other a series of articles from the New York Evening Post on juvenile delinquency, notwithstanding the extra expense of $248.50 on which I have an estimate from the Public Printer.

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

There was no objection.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we find in yesterday's RECORD some very interesting information as to how the money appropriated by this House for the so-called program of the Voice of America is being spent. It came to light in the Senate on yesterday that for the past 2 months two traveling observers have been covering the United States gathering information and making reports to foreign countries.

These observers have not said the first kind thing about any State they visited. Every State, one of which is my home State, has been smeared—Nevada, Utah, Texas, Pennsylvania, Alabama.

I want to read a few excerpts from what these fellow travelers had to say about my State and I want to deny every charge made in this report which has been beamed all over the world. They stated:

> We are at Birmingham, the Pittsburgh of the South, and the most important city in Alabama. It has a population of 300,000 and its principal industries are iron and steel. And this city is like those two metals, hard and poorly made. * * * It was constructed in a hurry and they have not had time to improve it.

The so-called observers had this to say about the capital city of Montgomery, Ala.:

> See what was holding up the traffic. An ox cart. That is a symbol of the spirit of Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of two fine, progressive cities of the South have been ridiculed and slandered, at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation, some of whom live in these cities of Montgomery and Birmingham.

Birmingham and Montgomery need no defense. Each is a progressive city where gracious living is a tradition. I dare say the percentage of Communists, fellow travelers, and pinks in these two cities is proportionately smaller than it is in the State Department, that agency of this Government which is responsible for this misinformation and slanderous mud that is being poured out over the wavelengths of the world in an effort to embarrass the States visited by these travelers, who could be only one kind of a traveler, and that is a fellow traveler.

Mr. Speaker, this latest display of nonsense convinces me that the State Department lacks the ability to carry out the program that was planned for the purpose of telling the peoples of the world at least some of the good things about this country. It is high time that this agency be abolished. I have today introduced a concurrent resolution seeking to have funds for the Voice of America stricken from the appropriation bill for the State Department. That Department, in my judgment, lacks the ability and common sense—and so little is required—to do a simple job; namely, tell the peoples of the world what a great nation we have. Instead, under permission, if not under direction, of the State Department, five of our great States have been ridiculed.

GREATER SAFETY FOR MINERS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago six miners were killed at Dante, Va., by the collapse of a roof where they were working. Last year 65,165 miners were killed or injured in the mines, this largely due to the lack of proper power given by Federal law to compel proper inspection on the State level.

I have insisted since I have been in Congress that the Federal law be amended to provide greater safety for miners.

On May 16, 1946, I asked on the floor of the House that the miners be given better safety and working conditions. Again, on April 9, 1947, after the Centralia mine disaster, I urged in a speech on the floor that something be done along this line.

Again, today, I urge the Congress to take action on H. R. 2907, a bill to provide for health and greater safety in the coal mines. Something should be done now in this direction.

I am including a part of both of the speeches above referred to:

[Thursday, May 16, 1946]

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia, and also in support of an amendment introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DIRKSEN.

These two amendments, if approved by the House, will add to the appropriation in the present bill approximately $485,000 in order to give the miners better safety conditions under which they will have to work.

Many Members of this House are advocating the gift or a loan to Great Britain of some $3,750,000,000. For my part, I am not supporting that loan, which would place an additional tax burden on the coal miners of America and also on all the other people. When we consider the expenditure of these billions to help Great Britain, I am rather amazed that we shall quibble about expending an additional $485,000 which would add 47 mine inspectors and, at the same time, continue the work looking to greater safety in an effort to bring about better working conditions for the miners who go down into the bowels of the earth and mine the coal which is essential to the industry and economic welfare of all of our people. I will take my position in the corner with the miners in an effort to help them, and I am perfectly willing to add this $485,000, because it will be an investment in the safety and the preservation of the lives and manpower of the miners of America.

Mr. Chairman, when I was home during the holidays a committee of miners headed by Mr. Pete Lenzini, of Centralia, Ill., called upon me urging that something be done along this very line in legislation to help

bring better safety and working conditions to the miners. Upon my return to Washington I went into this matter and made a study of it to see if a law could be enacted by the Federal Government which would compel the States and those operating mines in the States to effect better safety conditions in such mines. I have been informed that the Federal Government has gone about as far as it can when it set up the Safety Act with reference to miners in 1941; that the Federal Government can recommend but that it cannot compel the States to follow out its recommendation.

If I had my way and it could be done, I would support a Federal act that would compel the mine operators in every State to live up to the highest safety standards possible in the interest of the miners.

I am told that we are short some 45,000 miners in the United States today and that the majority of those working in the mines are between 40 and 65 years of age. I know many miners in my district between those ages who have worked 54 hours a week for the past 3 years in an effort to help the Government win the war and may I point out to you that the American miner, in part, due to better machinery, produces 4 tons of coal a day to 1 ton produced by the British miner. I do not believe any group of civilian men in America has worked as long hours under as dangerous conditions and has contributed more to the winning of the war than the miners of America.

Mr. Chairman, I want to do something, if this Congress can do it, to better their working conditions and to guard their physical welfare. I need only to cite the figures that over 1,000 miners lose their lives every year due to their dangerous employment and due to the lack of proper mine inspection and proper safeguards being thrown around them.

In addition to this, many thousands each year are injured.

If we pass this appropriation, which will add 47 mine inspectors and which will better the conditions generally under which they work, it will help to preserve the lives of the men now working and will encourage more men to enter this employment, which will be less hazardous under better safety conditions.

One of the great contentions which led to the present coal strike, which we hope will be settled soon, was this very question we are dealing with here today.

Let this Congress approve these appropriations and by so doing send out a message to the miners of America that the Members of Congress of the United States realize their just claim for better safety conditions under which they work, and that the Congress of the United States is moving in that direction with greater appropriations than ever voted to carry out research and better safety conditions under which the miners shall work in the future. Let us approve these amendments as an investment to preserve the life and to prevent accidents befalling the miners and let us continue along this line until the working conditions under which the miners of America work will be brought to the highest point of safety.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will increase this appropriation by an overwhelming vote. It would be a fine humanitarian move.

[April 9, 1947]

COAL-MINE DISASTERS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nation was shocked with the great loss of lives in the tragic explosion in the No. 5 Coal Mine at Centralia, Ill., which caused the death of 111 miners. The death of these men leaves 97 widows and 78 dependent children to face a sad and difficult future. These men lost their lives while employees of the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court confirmed this statement when it said in a recent decision with reference to the authority of the Government in dealing with the coal strike:

"Congress intended that by virtue of Government seizure, a mine should become, for purposes of production and operation, a Government facility in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership."

Mr. Speaker, when the Government took over these mines a safety code was agreed upon between the Government and the representatives of the United Mine Workers. This code laid down certain safety standards to protect the lives and safety of the coal miners. It was a binding contract signed by Mr. Krug, representing the Government, and Mr. Lewis, representing the miners. Investigations of the Centralia coal mine in November 1946 disclosed that the mine was in an unsafe and dangerous condition. In fact, the Federal inspectors reported some 50 violations, all of which were dangerous to the safety of the miners and called upon the Federal Government to take notice thereof and to correct such conditions. The Government failed to correct these conditions and on March 25, 1947, this disastrous explosion occurred with this great loss of lives.

By reason of these two disasters there are left a total of 267 widows and dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring some meager relief to these families so that their widows may carry on with proper food, clothing, medical care, and educational opportunities for their children, I have introduced a bill asking for an appropriation for $735,000 which equals the amount assessed in fines against the United Mine Workers organization, providing that this amount of money which comes to the Federal Government by reason of such fines be set up in a special fund to be administered on the basis of need, to provide relief and aid to the widows and dependent children of these two mine disasters, to be administered by the Social Security Administration.

This bill simply seeks to set aside money contributed over the years by the men in the mines who dug the coal, to offer some meager relief to the unfortunate widows and children of their fellow workers who lost their lives because they worked under hazardous conditions, which conditions were a violation of the contract on the part of the Federal Government in not correcting these dangerous conditions in the Centralia mine and upon the part of the mining company in not removing the dangerous hazards and conditions in the Straight Creek Co. mine in Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I understand a bill has been introduced providing that Federal inspectors may close down mines when they find that safety conditions demand it.

I believe it is the duty of the Congress to enact legislation along this line and other legislation to insure more safe working conditions. It is to be hoped that out of this recent tragedy at Centralia, Ill., in the loss of 111 miners, that the miners of the Nation will be benefited in the future through legislative action that will force and compel better working and better safety conditions throughout the coal mines of America.

Such legislation is imperative not only from the humanitarian standpoint but from an economic standpoint as well. One of the greatest natural resources left in America today is the coal in the earth. Billions of tons of coal, worth countless billions of dollars, coal enough to supply the United States for thousands of years in the future is one of our priceless great natural resources left.

Unless better safety conditions are provided, the sons of miners and others will not go down into the earth to bring up the coal. No other group of men in the factories of the Nation are permitted to work in the face of such hazards to life and limb as are the miners.

They have mined the coal which has powered our great steel and industrial developments, which has lighted and illuminated the countryside through rural electrification, lighted and powered the great cities through public utilities, that has brought untold comfort to millions of our people. They have furnished the power that has largely developed our great railway and transportation system. Our industrial progress in the future depends more upon coal than upon any other natural resource. The steel industry is basic and fundamental to the success of the industry of this Nation. Coal must power the great steel industry and other industries of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the miners of our Nation, as to their safety at their work, have been too long overlooked. Through their sweat and toil they have made a great and tremendous contribution to the development of our Nation and to the comfort of our people. There must be better safety conditions thrown around them to induce their sons and other young men to work in the mines of this country. I repeat, it is an economic problem as well as a humanitarian problem. Unless better conditions are brought about, this great wealth hoarded under the ground so necessary to the future development of our Nation will not be brought to the surface in sufficient quantities to drive America forward to its greatest destiny in the future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement about HON. KARL STEFAN.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, when the Economic Cooperation Administration justification was presented to the Appropriations Committee, it was found that the new Administration did not have sufficient facts at hand to justify the full expenditure of $4,300,000,000. For that reason the chairman had to postpone the report of the committee at least for a fortnight.

The other day, the Administrator, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and told them that "in the preliminary presentations of this project—ERP—the executive branch repeatedly emphasized that the European recovery program could not be neatly blue-printed in advance." He said that even though "a massive amount of study and work went into the preparation of the original plans, our studies have served only to underline the importance of this consideration."

At the same time, he told the Appropriations Committee of the other body,

and I quote, "as we study these problems we are more and more impressed with the fact that we can see only a little way ahead."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise the question of whether it is in keeping with the policy of this body to approve appropriations for expenditures for periods for which justifications cannot be presented. I submit that when this is the case as it was in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Congress has only appropriated for that period for which sufficient justification has been presented and that when the spending body is prepared to justify further expenditures a new supplementary appropriation be considered.

The total authorization for ECA exceeds the total budget for any peacetime year preceding that of the spending era which started in the early thirties when those in the executive branch became imbued with the idea that we could spend our way to prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, $4,300,000,000 is a lot of money. It is almost double the annual expenditures for all public elementary and secondary education in this country. Mr. Speaker, we should not appropriate funds until they can be justified. If ECA cannot now justify the full amount authorized we owe it to the Nation's taxpayers to appropriate only the sum that can be adequately justified at this time.

The world situation is changing from day to day and as Mr. Hoffman says "we can see only a little way ahead." For this reason I do not think that the Congress should appropriate money for a period which may, and probably will be, vastly different from what we now foresee. I hope the Appropriations Committee will give due consideration to the situation and recommend approval of the sum for only that period for which the ECA administrators can reasonably blueprint in advance.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN THE COLLECTION OF CERTAIN SALES TAXES

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call attention to the fact that the Rules Committee has granted a rule for the consideration of H. R. 5645, which is a bill to assist the States in the collection of certain sales taxes. On the face of the bill this appears as innocent as a lamb but, on the contrary, the matter is as vicious as a rattlesnake.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to this bill. Of course, I know all are very busy, but I hope that during the consideration of the bill full opportunity will be given to present to the Members the important implications involved in this matter.

VOICE OF AMERICA BROADCAST

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, with relation to the Voice of America broadcast mentioned by the gentleman from Alabama, may I say that I yield to no man in my respect for the several sovereign States of this Union nor to any man in my hatred for communism; however, I feel it should be made a matter of record that this Congress itself, through the power of appropriations, last year restricted the number of personnel available to the Voice of America for the preparation and supervision of general scripts and made it obligatory that private enterprise in large measure take over these functions.

The regrettable broadcasts which have been mentioned were, unfortunately, prepared and broadcast under the supervision of the National Broadcasting Company. It is my understanding that the employees responsible for the unfortunate choice of material have been discharged from their employment. I believe that it should go into the RECORD that this was not the act of any Government department, but was rather a direct result of an act of this Congress itself in limiting the supervisory personnel for this important function, and delegating almost unlimited discretionary powers for script preparation to private agencies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Indiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Senator MARTIN.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE JENKINS BILL

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the subject discussed a few minutes ago by my colleague from Delaware, I want to join with him in the sentiment which he expressed in opposition to the nefarious Jenkins bill which is designed to have the Federal Government help the States to collect local taxes. This bill is unconstitutional, unsatisfactory, unenforceable, unwise, and generally unsound. It must be defeated. It is going to take considerable more time to dispose of this bill than some people anticipate, if it is brought up today. There are plenty of Members opposed to it from the 10 States adversely affected and before we get through explaining what it is, we expect to have plenty of help from some of the rest of you.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] have made an attack on the bill of which I have the honor of being the author. As far as I know, they are the only two Congressmen who are opposed to it.

This bill which has attracted Nationwide attention is H. R. 5645—and is commonly referred to as the Jenkins bill.

This bill has Nation-wide support which it deserves. It is supported by the Members from about 40 out of the 48 States. There may be some half-hearted opposition from some Members from the States of Delaware and Missouri.

Forty out of the forty-eight States have laws which levy a tax on cigarettes. At the present time there is a heavy traffic of cigarettes from these 8 States which do not have a cigarette tax law into the States that do have laws levying a tax on cigarettes. In other words there is a big bootleg traffic of cigarettes into the 40 States which have tax laws for these bootleg cigarettes all sold in the tax States in violation of the law free of taxes. The tax States lose about $30,000,000 annually by reason of these bootlegging practices. This bill provides that a person shipping cigarettes in interstate commerce must notify the taxing authorities in the State into which cigarettes are shipped, giving him information as to whom the cigarettes were shipped and the amount and value of the cigarettes. From this information the taxing officer can locate such cigarettes and compel the person to whom they were shipped to pay the proper tax.

This bootlegging of cigarettes must be stopped. They should bear a tax just as all other cigarettes sold in that State pay a tax. The Jenkins bill will and should pass by an overwhelming majority.

BEVIN SKULDUGGERY

Mr. CELLER. 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. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain argues that for the United States to give a loan to Israel jeopardizes Arab peace.

That is unabashed cheek. A British general personally commands the British-financed, officered, and equipped

Arab Legion—really a British army—that is now bombing the holy places in Jerusalem and refuses to cease fire.

Britain feeds money into the Arab maw to destroy the state of Israel, now recognized by nine countries.

She arms and inflames the Arabs and then unabashedly complains when aid is offered her victims.

Bevin castigates President Truman's expressed desire financially to aid Israel for defense and resettlement of DP's.

That is hutzpa—Hebrew for "nerve"—like a man who murders his parents and then asks for clemency on the ground that he is an orphan.

Bevin is guilty of arrant knavery. He gives comfort to the enemies of peace and the saboteurs of the United Nations.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 83]

Anderson, Calif.	Harness, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Andrews, N. Y.	Hartley	Nicholson
Bell	Harvey	Norton
Bennett, Mich.	Heffernan	O'Hara
Bland	Hendricks	Owens
Bloom	Holifield	Pfeifer
Boykin	Jennings	Ploeser
Buckley	Johnson, Okla.	Potter
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Tex.	Powell
Carroll	Jones, N. C.	Rayburn
Chapman	Kearns	Rich
Clark	Kefauver	Riley
Clippinger	Kersten, Wis.	Rivers
Cotton	Kilday	Robertson
Coudert	King	Scoblick
Cravens	Landis	Scott, Hardie
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dingell	Lesinski	Sheppard
Dirksen	Ludlow	Short
Dolliver	Lusk	Sikes
Dorn	Lyle	Simpson, Pa.
Doughton	McDonough	Smith, Me.
Douglas	McDowell	Somers.
Eaton	Macy	Stigler
Engle, Calif.	Meade, Ky.	Stratton
Fellows	Meade, Md.	Thomas, N. J.
Fernandez	Meyer	West
Fuller	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Gathings	Miller, Conn.	Williams
Gwynne, Iowa	Mitchell	Wilson, Tex.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morrison	Wood
	Mundt	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials in each.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an editorial by Frank C. Waldrop and in the other a report to the House on the case of Mrs. Earl Browder.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Senator MARTIN.

TREATMENT OF SEXUAL PSYCHOPATHS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6071) to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 25, and page 5, line 1, strike out "of committing any other unnatural or perverted sexual act with any other person or animal" and insert "of having carnal copulation in an opening of the body except sexual parts with another person."

Page 5, line 15, after "be", insert ": *Provided*, That the accused, on motion, shall be entitled to be furnished with a bill of particulars, setting forth the particular acts which constitute the offense charged."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 615 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would permit any Member who desires time to speak out of order to speak first, so that we may devote the remainder of the time to a discussion of the bill.

Mr. SABATH. I always try to comply with any request from the gentleman from Ohio, and I shall with pleasure accede to the gentleman's request at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Foreign Service Officer Thomas C. Wasson, a gallant public servant, who was slain in line of duty on May 22, 1948, at Jerusalem.

Consul General Wasson was a native of Great Falls, Mont., and he listed New York City as his permanent home, but he was a one-time resident of my district, where he owned a farm in the county of Chesterfield. He had numerous friends in and around the city of Richmond who mourn his untimely death.

A veteran of World War I with overseas service, Mr. Wasson was studying Greek in Athens in 1920 when he met the late Alexander W. Weddell, who was stationed there in the American consular service. Mr. Weddell persuaded Mr. Wasson to enter the Foreign Service, which was the beginning of a notable diplomatic career. Melbourne, Naples, Florence, and Paris were among the foreign posts at which Mr. Wasson served with distinction.

It was my privilege to meet Mr. Wasson in Athens last fall when I visited that city, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. After a quarter century he had returned to the place where he had entered the Foreign Service. He was an ideal officer. Although you were impressed with his efficiency and skill in handling details, his calm and quiet manner relieved you of the feeling that you were encroaching on his time, and withal there was a graciousness about him that few men possess. He shared with me one of the rich experiences of my life when the two of us climbed up Mars Hill and stood together at the spot where the Apostle Paul delivered his famous oration to the Athenians.

Known among his associates for his personal courage, Mr. Wasson accepted his assignment to the hazardous Jerusalem post wtih the full knowledge of the dangers which it involved. While visiting in Richmond, Va., in March, he told a friend he had obtained two bullet proof vests which he planned to take to Jerusalem. He was quoted as having said to another, "I have a helmet down to my waist and wish it was all the way to the ground." Nevertheless, when the Department of State informed him that he was being considered for the post because of his record of courage and good judgment, he expressed appreciation of the confidence which the Department had shown in him and of the opportunity to serve his country at this extremely perilous post.

It was Mr. Wasson's function as consul general to keep this Government fully and accurately informed of developments

in Jerusalem and Palestine, and also to protect the lives and property of American citizens there. He was assiduous in carrying out these responsibilities, showing great ability and resourcefulness. The performance of his duties required him to maintain constant personal contact with Arab and Jewish leaders, daily passing through bullet-swept streets and battle lines with no protection other than the American flag on his car.

In addition, Mr. Wasson was a member of the three-man United Nations Security Council Truce Commission, to which he had been appointed by the President as the representative of the United States. It was while he was returning to his office from a meeting of this Commission of May 22 that Consul General Wasson was struck down by the bullet of an unknown sniper. Members of the consulate general staff carried him from the street to the safety of the office where he received immediate medical attention, but he died the following day.

His tour of duty in Jerusalem was not the first time that Mr. Wasson served his country at grave risk to his life. He was awarded the Medal for Freedom for his services as consul at Dakar, French West Africa, where he was under fire during World War II, as he established and maintained our Foreign Service post throughout the extremely delicate period of the German occupation of France.

The death of this devoted public servant in line of duty reflects great credit upon the Foreign Service which he loved. His heroic sacrifice is an inspiration to his colleagues in the service who are frequent companions of danger as they man their posts in every corner of this troubled world. The flag is still flying at Jerusalem as the staff of the consulate general carries on with courage, restraint, and dedication to duty.

One other servant of this Government at Jerusalem, Herbert M. Walker, of the United States Navy, has also lost his life, and still another, Thomas Gannon, has been wounded.

To Thomas C. Wasson and the men and women of his mold in the Foreign Service, we owe a debt of gratitude for their loyal, devoted, and patriotic service to our country under difficult, trying, and hazardous circumstances.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. It was my great privilege while traveling through Greece last year with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] to meet and know Thomas Wasson. He was a fine public servant. He died in the front line of duty, just as any American soldier.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said about the late Thomas C. Wasson.

Mr. Wasson was a native of Great Falls, Mont., which is one of the principal cities in the district I have the honor to represent. He was the son of the Reverend E. A. Wasson, who was pastor of the Episcopal Church in Great Falls at the time the late consul was born. Although the family left Great Falls when the boy was quite young, they are remembered by many of our older citizens.

We join the Nation in its pride in the courageous action of Thomas C. Wasson, and we wish to extend the sympathy of the people of his native place to his widow, his children, and his bereaved parents.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, it becomes my sad and very unhappy duty to announce to the House something that I know will strike grief, particularly to the hearts of those who preceded me here. I just learned with the deepest regret of the passing of my distinguished predecessor, Hon. William B. Oliver, this morning. Many of you called him and referred to him as Buck Oliver. His passing marks the end of a long life and fruitful life of public service. I believe he was 81 years old. Most of his life was devoted to the public service. Before entering the Congress he served for many years as solicitor or prosecuting attorney of my judicial circuit. Then he became dean of the Law School of the University of Alabama from which position he was elected to Congress 22 years before his retirement. He was opposed only twice for Congress. When he came here, he defeated the lovable and distinguished lamented former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. William B. Bankhead, who came to the House 2 years later representing a new congressional district.

Then, he had another unsuccessful opponent 20 years later, 2 years after which he retired.

I need not call the attention of those who knew him and loved him here to his great ability, his lovable personality and his valuable and constructive service to the country. He was very generally loved. I know not only the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Alabama and all of Alabama generally, but those who served with him here will share my deep grief over his passing, even at such a ripe old age. I am equally confident that you will all wish to join me in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. Oliver and the other bereaved ones.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the hearts of all Alabamians have been saddened today by the news of the passing of the Honorable William Bacon Oliver, former Member of Congress, who represented the Sixth District of Alabama for 22 years, retiring voluntarily in January 1937. It would be possible for one to memorialize indefinitely on the contributions Congressman Oliver made to our State and Nation. He was a forceful and most competent educator. As an attorney at law, he was a gifted and learned barrister. In Congress where he served for so long as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Oliver rose to the rank of a true statesman. To those of us who were privileged to know Mr. Oliver personally and had a full opportunity to witness his superlative qualities, our sentiments are best expressed in those memorable lines:

Should you go first and I remain,
One thing I'd have you do:
Walk slowly down the path of death,
For soon I'll follow you.
I'll want to know that each step you take
That I may walk the same,
For some day down that lonely road
You'll hear me call your name.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everyone who served with or knew Buck Oliver, as we endearingly called him, agrees with everything the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has said. Buck Oliver was not only respected but highly esteemed. He was one of the outstanding Members of this body. I remember when I first came here, he was one of a group of mental giants who were gathered around Jack Garner, and as a young Member of this body, I learned much by my association with them. Buck Oliver was one of the most able and eloquent speakers I ever listened to, and I can picture him now in the well of this House forcibly expressing his views in that eloquent manner of his.

I am deeply grieved to learn of his passing, and I join with my friend and the Alabama delegation in expressing my deep sympathy to the loved ones he leaves behind.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I learn with the deepest regret of the passing of Mr. Oliver. He had a distinguished service in this chamber, approximating a quarter of a century, and retired voluntarily over the earnest protests of his friends and colleagues here in the House and in his congressional district.

It was my pleasure and privilege to serve with him on the same committee and subcommittee and to have him as my first subcommittee chairman.

He left an indelible impress upon all who were fortunate enough to be associated with him and I shall remember always with appreciation the lessons learned under his wide and gracious tutelage.

He was an eminent lawyer, had enjoyed a wide and selective practice and had served as dean of the University of Alabama before coming to Congress. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, a man of ripe scholarship and one of the most eloquent men to serve in the House within my recollection.

He took his duties seriously and was assiduous in committee work and gave unstintedly of his time and exceptional talents to the exacting requirements of his service in the House.

He was a man of lofty ideals and strength of character, tactful, considerate, and courteous, and generous in his

friendships. He measured up in every respect to the high standards of his native State which has sent more than its share of able and distinguished statesmen to the two Houses of Congress. His State is honored and the annals and traditions of the House of Representatives enriched by his service here.

I join with those here who knew and loved him in extending deepest sympathy to those of his family he leaves behind.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the dean of the Alabama delegation.

Mr. HOBBS. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman who so ably represents the Sixth District for the announcement he has made and the way he has made it. There is nothing more that could be added in tribute to our friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the same permission which has been granted the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] may be extended to the other seven members of the Alabama delegation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, "Buck" Oliver, as he loved to be called and was known to millions, has passed on to his reward.

He was born in Eutaw, Greene County, Ala., May 25, 1867, and after a life dedicated to and spent in service lovingly rendered his God, family, friends, State, and Nation he entered his eighty-second year day before yesterday.

A dutiful and devoted son, he lavished a wealth of tender care on his great mother.

Alabama has at least her share of great lawyers, but few have equaled, fewer still surpassed, him in his knowledge of the law, his ability to impart that knowledge, or in his devoted service to his clients. His standing with the highest rank in his chosen profession, as practitioner, solicitor of his circuit, dean of the Law School of the University of Alabama, and Congressman is secure.

There was no lack of appreciation of another outstanding Alabamian, William B. Bankhead, when the battle of giants for the congressional seat William B. Oliver was to occupy for 22 years, was decided in favor of the older competitor, and no man was more delighted than was Congressman Oliver when his younger, erstwhile opponent but friend, joined him 2 years later as colleague in Congress, representing a newly created district. They each served with fidelity and distinction, and it was the happy privilege of the senior to nominate the junior and to aid in his election as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Having been born and reared in one of the strongholds of democracy, outstanding even in Alabama, it was only natural that William B. Oliver should have become a Democratic warrior. He was a Democrat without apology, but too much of a gentleman ever to give offense to political foes even in the fiercest fights. His was a perfect voice, and his skill in using it, made his forensic ability both feared and admired. He was a wise counselor, a tried, true, and trusted leader.

The Presbyterian Church, of which he was a devout member, chose and kept him an elder. He was one of the few laymen ever elected moderator of the highest church court of his State—the Synod of Alabama.

So, he may truly say:

> I have fought a good fight,
> I have finished my course,
> I have kept the faith.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 615 makes in order the bill H. R. 6705 under a rule which will waive all points of order against the bill or any provisions thereof. This rule is necessary, in the opinion of the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee, in order that points of order may not be made against certain provisions which, very frankly, are nothing more nor less than legislation on an appropriation bill; legislation, however, that I have been informed has the approval of the legislative committees involved, such as the Committee on Public Lands.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. What did I understand my friend to say with reference to approval by the Committee on Public Lands of this rule?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I meant to say I understood there was no objection from any of the committees which might have an interest in this bill to a rule waving points of order.

Mr. WELCH. I am sorry to differ with my esteemed friend, but no member of the Committee on Public Lands, including the chairman, had any knowledge that the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior was going before the Rules Committee to ask for a waiver of all points of order.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sorry if the committee did not discuss it with the gentleman, and notify him that they were appearing before the committee asking for this rule. I have simply stated the information which has been given to me.

Mr. WELCH. If I may say a word further——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. I have great respect for the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules who is now presenting the rule to the House. Personally I resent very much waiving all points of order against certain provisions which should be considered by the appropriate legislative committee. It is an infringement on the legislative committee of this House by a Subcommittee on Appropriations. As chairman of the Committee on Public Lands I resent it very much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy to have the statement of the able gentleman from California, chairman of the great Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WELCH. Without any intention of criticizing the gentleman from Ohio, these provisions, in my judgment, are legislative provisions and as such fall within the province of legislative committees, not a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman has made his point very clear.

Let me say that in the final analysis the Committee on Rules does have the responsibility of deciding whether or not a rule waiving points of order shall be granted on any measure, and the Rules Committee has granted this rule on the basis of information which has been furnished it.

I am very sorry to learn, and it is the first information of that nature I have had, that the gentleman from California was not consulted by the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations prior to the time they appeared before the committee.

Mr. WELCH. Not only was the chairman of the committee not consulted, but no other member of the committee was consulted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sorry, I cannot yield further. I am sure that the gentleman would not want to speak for every member of the committee unless he has consulted each individual member and knows for a certainty that they have not talked to any of the members of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations.

Let me go a little further, if I may, in regard to this bill and rule. The language in the bill, upon which the rule waives points of order, has been carefully drawn in an effort to prevent certain abuses which have constantly occurred in the Reclamation Service and other branches of the Interior Department. A special subcommittee of this House headed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is another member, has been making an investigation which discloses activities and actions in the Department of Reclamation that, to say the very least and to be charitable, are reprehensible. In my opinion some of the things that have been done, and which this bill attempts to correct, have been criminal, and if we had the proper enforcement of law some of those responsible for these abuses would now be under prosecution or in prison.

Let me say further that this bill does not go nearly as far in meeting the situation as the special subcommittee, which has been investigating the whole matter, requested the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations to go. This bill is rather a compromise. The chairman of the subcommittee has been very zealous in an attempt to make certain that the proper rights, interests, and privileges of those employed in these agencies have been protected.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Ohio has just mentioned the fact that

abuses to no end have been carried on in the Interior Department which should have been corrected a long time ago by legislation. I want to say that the reason we found ourselves compelled to put some language in this bill, to which the chairman of the Public Lands Committee has objected, is because of the fact that he as chairman of that committee has refused to act and to do something about bringing out the legislation that would correct those abuses.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, there have been all sorts of abuses and attempts to evade the will of the Congress in reference to the appropriations that have been made by transferring funds here, there, and everywhere. All sorts of propaganda and political activity have been engaged in—certainly types of activity this House as a whole would not approve.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary this rule be adopted. Under it the bill is open for amendment. You can strike out any provision of the bill you may wish to strike out, you can add any amendment to the measure you may wish to add. All this rule does by waiving points of order is to permit the House to work its will and to prevent one individual Member of the House from striking out some important provision of the bill on a point of order. Under this rule the majority of the membership of this body, rather than one individual, may make the decision as to what the measure shall contain when it leaves the House of Representatives on its way to the Senate. I do not believe that is an unreasonable request on the part of the subcommittee. It is only fair, on an important measure like this, especially where there has been so much smoke and so many charges and countercharges, that the entire House be permitted to pass upon the different issues contained in this measure.

As I said before, you can change the bill as you see fit, by amendment, under this rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, once more the Committee on Appropriations is violating the established rules of the House by bringing in legislation in an appropriation bill. I have at all times tried to protect the legislative committees of this House that have jurisdiction of legislation that is frequently inserted and embodied in appropriation bills. The rule before us waives points of order, and naturally points of order that could have been made against the legislation, which is not properly the function of the Committee on Appropriations, would have been sustained. But, under this rule anything and everything that has been embodied in this appropriation bill concerning legislation will remain in the bill, unless the committee or the House later on will see fit to eliminate it, and I hope it will.

There are some provisions in this bill that have no place in this legislation, and later on some of the Members will call attention to it, especially to section 5 on page 96, which still further restricts the Government employee and subjects him to fine and imprisonment if, by chance, he may not have the influence with his union to control its actions, if they fail to comply with some of the provisions under the drastic antilabor legislation that you have passed here to destroy organized labor and the rights of laboring men of this Nation. I feel this proposed drastic provision is unwarranted because it is my opinion that Government employees are the most loyal and patriotic citizens of our country. I shall do everything in my power to eliminate the provision. Well, as I said, the other gentlemen will call attention more clearly to the unfair, unjustifiable, and unwarranted provisions in this bill. It has no business in an appropriation bill whatsoever. Oh, I know that other committees have violated the rules of the House the same as this committee has, but two wrongs never make a right.

Now, as to the bill before us I will say this, that it provides for about $112,000,000 more than for the fiscal year 1948. I am informed, and I know properly so, that the Democratic members of this committee have tried to see that some of the departments that are serving the Nation well, with splendid records, were not actually handicapped and destroyed, as it was the intention originally of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take a great deal of time, having promised to help to bring about the enactment of some legislation that has not been called up. We have quite a program, and I believe that we still have time to pass some of the legislation. When they ask me not to take too much time, I do not know whether they had in mind to save time to bring up (1) the housing bill that has been bottled up by the Committee on Banking and Currency, depriving our ex-servicemen of decent homes. I also wonder whether you will decide to bring in (2) legislation that would stop the constant increase in the cost of living. Despite the fact that you have promised the people that you will hold down the prices of food and necessities of life, they have steadily increased.

I wonder whether you plan to consider (3) legislation that is generally recommended, namely, the living wage for the Government and postal employees; whether you are going to bring in (4) the world health organization bill, that the country demands, or (5) the social-security bill, that has been recommended and rerecommended by President Truman, or whether you are going to consider (6) the bill allowing the admission of a limited number of the unfortunate and long-suffering displaced persons which would save the Government millions of dollars, and whether you are going to bring in other legislation that might be in the interest of the people.

In the hope that you intend to do so, I shall not use more time, to give you a chance to bring in here some of these bills. However, in view of your past record, I fear very much that you will not do anything that would be in the interest of the American people, in the interest of the ex-servicemen, in the interest of the housewives, and in the interest of the white-collared people. Failure on your part will eliminate your dreams of victory in 1948, because the American people will hold you responsible for the failures. And before I conclude, when will you bring in (7) the fair employment bill, that you promised the American people 2 years ago and again last year you would enact into law. I am sorry that up to now you have disregarded the rights of the people, especially those of the common man.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call the attention of the House to the language on page 96 of the bill. In line 10 we find the following language:

> Or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947—

That language is the Keefe amendment. That is bad enough, but adding more violence to the antilabor violence of the Keefe amendment we find the following:

> and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is not a single legislative committee of this House that would have written this kind of a statute.

What this language means is simply that if a Federal employee belongs to a union whose officers have not filed the so-called anti-Communist oath, and that member receives or accepts a salary, he shall be subject to the penalty of $1,000 fine, and not more than 1 year imprisonment. I do not believe there is a single Member of the House who upon the exercise of considered judgment on this matter would be willing to go that far. To have a rule waiving all points of order to this particular language is about the most extreme illustration of arrogance on the part of any committee in the 12 years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. Certainly if we did not have this rule waiving points of order, this language would go out on a point of order. It does not belong here. It should never have been put in. Why should this language be protected by a rule waiving all points of order?

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, I think the language goes much further than the gentleman has indicated. Suppose a man joins a labor union subsequent to the time that the head of the union refuses to sign the non-Communist affidavit, and he subsequently is paid. Is he not then liable to imprisonment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Definitely. There is no question about that. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

This is one of the most extreme antilabor provisions that has ever been presented to the House of Representatives. Yet the Committee on Rules has granted the rule waiving all points of order. This language is not only subject to a

point of order, but I think is subject to the censure of all decent Americans.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and which he frankly admitted were made in good faith and which conveyed to the House the impression that other standing committees of the House were either expressly in favor of the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations in writing legislation into this bill or that they did not object thereto. I was also very much interested in what the gentleman from California, my friend [Mr. WELCH] had to say. He is one of the few shining lights on the Republican side of the House so far as a progressive outlook is concerned. I would like to investigate this matter further because it gives off a strange odor as the result of the observation of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. It is the odor of the power lobby. May I ask the gentleman from California if he will explain just how the legislative provisions written into this bill in relation to the Bureau of Reclamation affect the interests of the people who are being served? In other words, what would be the effect of this under existing progressive legislation and the conditions that now exist?

Mr. WELCH. The effect will be harmful, if not destructive.

Mr. McCORMACK. The effects will be destructive in what direction?

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

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will indulge us a moment. When the gentleman got up and started to speak, I became suspicious also because the gentleman is interested in this.

Will the gentleman from California answer one more question? Destructive in what way?

Mr. WELCH. Destructive in the same manner that what is known as the original Rockwell bill, which prohibited the use of interest components on hydroelectric power for the development of irrigation and reclamation projects in the West. That bill, as you will recall, was amended in committee; reported by unanimous vote from the Committee on Public Lands of this House, and it withstood every assault made to amend and emasculate it, and finally was recommitted and amended. The bill as amended was sent to the Senate, and it has been wrapped up in moth balls in the Senate and has not been considered. This rule will make possible the very thing that was done over the unanimous vote and wish and will of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McCORMACK. The provisions of this bill are detrimental to the best interests of the average person?

Mr. WELCH. To every multiple reclamation and irrigation project throughout the West. I stand on that statement.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman would be specific and tell us just how this bill would be destructive to the development of the West. Please be specific. The gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is the only man from the West that I know of in either party who is objecting to this bill in any way, shape, or form. I wish the gentleman would be specific.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to get the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] into a debate with the gentleman from Iowa because I think he would knock the gentleman from Iowa for a goal, so I will yield to him for the purpose of telling the gentleman why he thinks this is an iniquitous provision in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

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

Mr. WELCH. I have stated that if the purpose of this rule and bill is carried to its logical conclusion, it will retard, if not prevent, further development of irrigation and reclamation projects in the West, particularly multiple projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Is that the gentleman's answer? The gentleman has not stated specifically what this bill would do in the way of destroying anything.

Mr. WELCH. My answer is clear.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, it certainly is not an answer. Tell us why it is destructive. Tell us what it does and what it does not do in any one instance. Maybe the gentleman from New York would like to tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems very strange that we have a standing committee definitely sidetracked. This is an unusual situation. It appears to me it is a continuance of the efforts of the power lobby to get an advantage, which they have been carrying on rather successfully for the past 2 years.

I hope this matter during general debate will be explored, so that the Members will be given the benefit of just what the legislative provisions in this respect will bring about.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am chairman, has been brought into this rule now pending before the House.

May I, in the few minutes allotted me, give this House a brief history of the Committee on Public Lands, which consists of six former legislative committees. It was created under the Reorganization Act of 1946. During its brief existence 615 bills have been referred to the committee, of which 249 have been reported to this House. Twenty-eight bills are now before the President. Forty-eight bills are now before the Senate. Thirty-three bills are now before this House. That is part of the work of the Committee on Public Lands. One hundred and nine bills have become public laws; 29 bills have become private laws.

Mr. Speaker, under the Reorganization Act the Committee on Public Lands, like other legislative committees, could have employed a staff of four so-called experts. The members of the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman are all experts in their particular lines and we therefore have not found it necessary to employ a full staff of professionals. As a result, we have saved $100,000 of the people's taxes, a record of which the committee is justly proud.

Despite these facts, and they are facts and will stand any test you care to apply to them, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior Affairs aims, by indirection, through this rule, by writing legislation into an appropriation bill, to do what it could not do through the duly authorized legislative Committee on Public Lands, as it applies to multiple irrigation and reclamation districts of the West.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me some more time?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will help the gentleman out some.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take time on the rule, but things have been said here today that make me hurt inside, to think that such language could be used against some members of our committee at a time when no other committee in Congress has given so much time in conducting hearings—weeks, yes, into the months—as has this Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. I know of no committee of the House in the nearly 12 years I have been a Member that has listened so patiently to anybody who wanted to testify.

My colleague from California threw a challenge out here as though he were the only man who ever conserved a dollar on a committee or brought legislation to the floor that resulted in the saving of money. I could name a number of committees that have from time to time made such savings as to make the $100,000 the gentleman speaks of appear as chicken feed. I am not saying it boastfully, but I brought three separate bills to this House that saved between $13,000,000 and $14,000,000 each and every year in the handling of Government records. We should not permit anyone to abuse the members of this committee. They have done a good job. The State of California, from which both Mr. WELCH and I come, receives $40,000,000 of funds for reclamation, irrigation, and power facilities that the committee has provided as a result of the hearings and information presented to them. As one member, I want to congratulate the committee for bringing in a good bill—as good as could be presented at this time—and I know that it will pass the House before we adjourn today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take up for a minute or two this provision on pages 95 and 96 of the bill relative to the loyalty oath required of officers of labor unions. I think my position is well known in unswerving activity and advocacy of regulatory labor legislation. I do not think anyone will question that. But I do think it is highly important that such legislation should not be restrictive, unfair, and unjust.

If you will read this section, and I hope you will, those of you who like myself have striven for proper regulatory labor legislation will reach the same conclusion I have reached that this is a very bad provision, that it is a very repressive provision and ought to be either amended or stricken from this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it only fair to say to the membership of the House, and as the gentleman from Virginia well knows, when this bill was before the Rules Committee there was serious question raised by a number of members of the Rules Committee on both sides of the table as to this particular section of the bill. Attention was called to the fact it could be stricken out by amendment on the floor of the House and that some of the members of the Rules Committee would support such an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to call the attention of the Members that it should be amended or entirely stricken out. It is most drastic. As a matter of fact, if you will look at page 95, a man who is entirely innocent by his association with an organization that has failed without his knowledge to sign this oath can be convicted of a felony and sent to the penitentiary, while, as I say, he might be perfectly innocent.

When this same provision was up for consideration in another bill, I suggested some corrective language, which was voted down; but I do hope that the Members in charge of this bill, and I am sure they will, during general debate consider an appropriate amendment to this bill to modify it so as to take out this very restrictive and very unjust provision.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the concluding speaker in support of this rule, I want to again point out that this rule simply waives points of order. It does not in any way interfere with the right of the House to amend the measure as it may see fit. As I said, when the gentleman from Virginia yielded to me a moment ago on this particular section of the bill relative to membership in a labor union where an officer has failed to take the anti-Communist oath, there was a grave question in the minds of various members of the Rules Committee as to the advisability of this particular portion of the bill or this section; however, it was believed by a heavy majority of the Rules Committee it was so necessary and vital to waive points of order on other provisions of the bill, that might otherwise be subject to a point of order, that the rule should be granted notwithstanding this particular provision being included in the measure, with the thought that the House, in its wisdom, could amend that particular section, could strike it out entirely, or do with it as the Members wished.

Again, I call attention to the fact that the only thing this rule does is to permit the House to work its will by a majority vote rather than to permit one individual Member, by making a point of order, to strike out important legislative provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commission of Fine Arts of their activities during the period July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1948.*

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

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 consideration of the bill H. R. 6705, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I desire first to pay my regards and appreciation to the members of this committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has been very diligent in attending meetings, and being the son of a coal-mine inspector, and having grown up in the coal-mining region, and having a great interest in mines and mining of every kind, I requested him to take charge of matters dealing with the Bureau of Mines. He has done a very fine job. He traveled for months inspecting mines and laboratories all over the country, and I have nothing but the highest praise for the work he has done and I want to thank him. To the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], having considerable interest in the Territories and having traveled considerably, I assigned the task of taking charge of items relating to our government in the Territories. He has taken a great interest in that.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] has been very active in affairs pertaining to the Indians for many, many years. Coming, as he does, from the State of Oklahoma, which has a large Indian population, he has learned a lot about Indian affairs, and when he came on the committee this year I requested him to take charge of matters dealing with Indian affairs.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has worked hard and long in straightening out a lot of the things that need to be straightened out in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I am sure that the things he has done will show results.

The members of the committee on the minority side, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are all fine, upstanding men, who have cooperated to the fullest extent. I have high praise for every one of them, and I want them to know that I appreciate their work and the cooperation they have given me, and the fine attitude they have taken.

Mr. Chairman, we have two clerks on the committee. The chief clerk, Mr. William Duvall, has been with the committee 20 years. He knows the Interior Department from A to Z. Because of his work and the things he helps us do he is simply indispensable. He is always on the job, and I tell you it takes a lot of work and long hours of work and figuring to carry on the work of this committee. His assistant, Bert Skinnard, started with the committee this year and has done a magnificent job. We thank both of them.

Mr. Chairman, we sat in committee for 11 weeks of hearings from 10 until 6 every day, 5 days a week, listened to 400 or more witnesses, and tried to get the information that was necessary for the committee to have in order to straighten out a lot of things that have been going on in the Interior Department which needed straightening out. We think the bill we have brought here today, if put into effect, and the language we have in the bill, if enacted, will improve the service the country is getting from the Reclamation Bureau and other bureaus throughout the entire Interior Department.

A lot was said about certain provisions in this bill. Of course it was necessary to put in this bill provisions which you could call legislation, I presume. However, many of them are limitations on appropriations. I am sure that anyone who could have sat with us on the committee and heard the testimony we heard would have agreed that we were justified in putting these provisions in the bill.

I am not apologizing for any of them. I am not apologizing for the language which the gentlemen who spoke on the rule called attention to and opposed, because I think the time has come when we cannot tolerate a lot of these un-American activities which are going on. If they are allowed to go on much longer, no legislation will stop them. Certainly I want to stop these radical groups from destroying everything we hold dear in America by legislation rather than wait until the time comes when we may have to stop them with bullets.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The bill is subject to amendment at any place, is it not?

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly it is.

Mr. Chairman, I shall now explain as best I can in the time I have the amount we have allowed for the different departments. Congressmen FENTON, SCHWABE, and I traveled 9,500 miles by automobile last fall through the Western States. The trip took 7 weeks. We talked to thousands of people in and out of the Department and in every walk of life. There was much complaint. They complained mostly about the fact, it seems, that the Reclamation Bureau and other bureaus had transferred funds from their particular project and spent it some place else and that their project had suffered accordingly. So the committee has seen fit to earmark and designate specifically where much of the money in the bill should be spent. I am sure there is not a Member of the Congress who is not anxious, willing, and ready to help appropriate money to do everything necessary for the orderly development of the Western States and for the conservation of our natural resources, both in the United States and in the Territories.

We hear a great deal of talk about some of us being stooges for this or that organization for private utilities, and for other private interests. As I have said many times before, this committee, not a single member of it, Democrat or Republican, is stooging for anybody but the American people, the taxpayers of America—the good people of America. I resent any such accusation to the very limit of my feeling. I know every member of this committee feels the same way. I am sure there is not a member of the committee on either side of the aisle who has any other purpose than to do a good job for the American people and help develop the west in an orderly, businesslike manner.

The bill as it came from the Budget Bureau contained estimates totaling $459,970,835. The bill as it comes to the floor of the House has been reduced to $375,677,591, or a reduction of $84,293,244. That reduction is about 18.3 percent. I do not know how some people figure. I saw in the newspapers where they said it was only a reduction of 12 percent plus.

I would like to mention one other thing in connection with construction funds for the Bureau of Reclamation. I do not think many people realize that there was a $90,000,000 carry-over from 1947 to 1948 in the Bureau of Reclamation alone. This year there is an estimated carry-over of approximately $27,000,000 from 1948 to 1949 in the Bureau of Reclamation. Consequently it is necessary to appropriate more money to carry on these projects, many of which, especially the large ones, are at the peak of their construction. So last year we appropriated altogether, counting carry-overs from the 1947 fiscal year, an amount which would bring the available money for 1948 for reclamation up to around $218,682,000. This year we have an estimated approximate carry-over of nearly $27,000,000. We are appropriating approximately $210,000,000. So we will have available money for reclamation, for the fiscal year 1949, $237,000,000.

Of course, there is another thing that must be taken into consideration. That is the fact that the Bureau has been spending the 10-percent hold-back money, which is held back each year by the Government on contracts. On the first half of each contract there is 10 percent held back to guarantee proper performance of the contract. That money has been spent by the Bureau, and has not been held in reserve for the contractor, nor has it been taken out of the appropriated funds. We discovered that was the case, so the committee asked the Bureau to give us some facts as to how much these hold-backs would amount to up to June 30, 1949, which is the end of the year for which we are appropriating. We learned that it would be around $16,000,000, and if we appropriated the whole sum that would have been included. We have reduced the appropriation for the Reclamation Bureau around $51,000,000. Consequently, it was estimated that the hold-backs would amount to about $14,000,000, which we have provided must be paid out of the money we have appropriated in this bill for reclamation. So it reduces the amount to that degree, which Reclamation will have available to spend this year.

We feel it is only fair that we do that, because the money has already been spent on the project. To again appropriate more money to pay for this work in a separate item, I think would be bad legislation. So we are requiring that this hold-back money be paid from the funds herein appropriated.

I wanted to explain that so that everyone will understand that projects will be affected to the degree of the hold-backs which have not been paid, and which must be paid out of this appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As a matter of fact, that is the common practice in municipal contracts. We have always looked at money appropriated for a specific purpose as a trust fund. Therefore, they have no right to dip into that and use it for other purposes.

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is the view of this committee, that that is a trust fund and should not be used for any other purpose but the contract for which it was set aside?

Mr. JENSEN. That is correct.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. How else can the Congress control funds unless you follow this procedure?

Mr. JENSEN. That is what we asked the Bureau. They said, "Oh, we have been doing that for a long time." We asked them for the authority to do it. So they cited a colloquy between former Congressman Byrns, who was then chairman of the Deficiency Committee in the year 1932, and Henry Kaiser. Henry Kaiser had a contract with the Reclamation Bureau. Congressman Byrns stated in this colloquy that there was such a deficit, meaning a Federal deficit, that the Congress might not feel inclined to appropriate this 10-percent item. So nothing was done further than that. But the Bureau took that colloquy between Congressman Byrns and Henry Kaiser as having the weight of law.

Mr. HORAN. I might say to the gentleman that I do not want any loose fiscal policy or operation interfering with the sound and progressive development of my State in the West.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure of that, and I am sure that is the feeling of everybody in the West. They want the West developed in an orderly and businesslike manner. I am sure that the Western people are willing to pay that part of the development of the West which can be justly charged to them.

There are a number of things that the committee did not reduce, a number of items which in the judgment of the committee should not be touched, such as the $15,000,000 requested by the Department for the rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad and an item of $8,500,000 plus for the construction and servicing of highways in Alaska, and a million or two for the building of facilities in Alaska to cope with the terrible tuberculosis situation that exists up there among the natives. I believe no one in Congress or in America would want to reduce any of these appropriations. Likewise, the appropriations for transmission lines in Washington which affect the Hanford atomic energy plant, $22,000,000 in cash and contract authorizations for the Bureau which the Bonneville Power Administraton contends has to do with the Hanford project. I believe no one in this House or in the committee wants to tamper with anything that might be detrimental to the work of the Hanford project. So there were a few items we could not touch.

As far as personal services are concerned, it is true that the committee has limited personal services in the Bureau of Reclamation to the amount that will be expended in the fiscal year 1948, but it will be necessary for the Bureau of Reclamation to pay terminal leave out of that $45,000,000, to pay in-grade promotions out of that $45,000,000; in fact, to pay everything pertaining to personal services out of that $45,000,000. The Committee possibly would have been justified in making further reductions in

the personal services with so much inefficiency in some parts of the Bureau, but we do not like to penalize the people of the West or the people who are directly interested in these appropriations just because some of the administration is not up to what we expect. After all, we are dealing with the production of power, of metals and minerals which we need in this country, and which certainly we would need in an emergency. So we have not felt justified in reducing the personnel of the Service to the degree that some folks might feel it should have been reduced. Another thing to be remembered is that many of these projects are just at the peak of construction: Davis Dam, Central Valley, Colorado-Big Thompson, the Columbia River Basin, and the Missouri Valley project.

I may say that the territory affected by those five projects covers about one-fourth of the entire area of the United States. For this reason it is going to take more personnel services, more engineering and more administration to carry on these projects in the year 1949 than it has in the past, but we are sure we have furnished enough money so that they can carry on in an orderly, business-like manner.

In this reclamation program we are irrigating approximately a million acres of land for the benefit of veterans—homesteads—on which the veterans are anxious to live. They have filed on these homesteads. Many of them have already gone on the irrigated lands which we have made available to them by reclamation and irrigation. In the Columbia River Basin alone veterans will have preference from homesteads on approximately 500,000 acres of that land. We do not want to wait until the veteran gets so old he cannot farm before he is located on a homestead. So we try to make enough money available here to bring the project forward as fast as is economically feasible so that those veterans who did such a wonderful job for the American people in bringing the last World War to a successful conclusion may benefit. Certainly they are entitled to that consideration. If we do not appropriate sufficient funds to carry on those projects, then many of these veterans are going to be too old to get out and do the hard job of farming that is necessary on irrigated land. I do not think there are many people in the country as a whole who would want to cut those projects out that I have mentioned, which are for our national defense and for the good of the veterans.

Mr. Chairman, we have made a thorough report on this whole undertaking consisting of some 72 pages. I think I shall simply say that anyone who is interested and will take the time to read this report will see that the committee has done a good job, not only in furnishing money for the development of the West, but also for everything else pertaining to the development of the whole country, the development of our national resources, and so forth.

I would like to refer briefly to the Bureau of Mines. Who wants to cut too deeply in funds required for the Bureau of Mines when we need all of these critical minerals, metals, and oil? We have no stock piles of any consequence today. The Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey also have done a grand job in locating these new deposits of oil and metals and minerals. We have reduced them some. But I wonder if there is anybody in this House or in the country who would like to reduce them to the point where they could not operate effectively for the good of the Nation?

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I note particularly the last remark that the gentleman made in regard to the firm support of the mining industry in this bill, and I want to add my approval of that, too. I want to say to the gentleman that I recognize, although not being a member of the committee, how earnestly this subcommittee has worked. I recall coming before the committee late one day and having to wait 2 hours until a dozen other witnesses were heard, but the gentleman and his committee remained long after hours to hear my constituents, for which I want to express appreciation. I notice the earmarking of $200,000 for aerial pellet seeding to further soil-conservation work, as indicated on page 7 of the report, which I want to express approval of. I want to ask the gentleman this question:

I notice in regard to the appropriation for the management of the All-American Canal that the budget had asked for $216,000, which was not allowed, but there is another provision in the bill concerning the management of the All-American Canal. Can the gentleman explain that a bit further? Is the All-American Canal to be under the management of the Government for the coming year?

Mr. JENSEN. We consolidated that item with the construction item, and it will carry on just as before.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is no danger then that the All-American Canal and the Imperial diversion dam will be taken over and turned over to private management?

Mr. JENSEN. No, not as far as I know. That is going to take some further legislation.

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

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

Mr. LEFEVRE. I notice there is an appropriation of $15,000,000 for the Alaska Railroad.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Is that for extending the line, or rebuilding it?

Mr. JENSEN. That is for rehabilitation. There is no extention.

Mr. LEFEVRE. No extension?

Mr. JENSEN. Simply rehabilitation. As the gentleman knows, the railroad got into terrible shape during the war.

Mr. LEFEVRE. I know that. I visited Alaska last summer.

Mr. JENSEN. It was necessary to either tear the road up and discontinue it, or rehabilitate it and get it in some kind of shape. A year ago last winter the derailments of freight cars averaged one and one-half derailments a day, and it is a mystery that many lives were not lost, though some were lost.

Mr. LEFEVRE. I think that is a very important thing to do.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GEARHART. I feel that I would be remiss in the performance of my duties as a Member of this body if I did not rise at this time to express my admiration and my very high respect for the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman who now occupies the floor is the distinguished chairman, for, indeed, there has occurred during his incumbency as chairman a most encouraging change in procedure and in result. The days of blind bag-grabbing appropriations are over. Because of the insistance upon evidence of the necessity as a justification for an appropriation, the fiscal affairs of the Republic are in better shape than they have been in years—and public confidence grows apace.

The gentleman from Arizona a moment ago called attention to the fact that the subcommittee habitually sat long hours in order to hear everyone desiring to be heard, the humblest of our citizens being accorded the same careful consideration that is extended to the famous figures of high influence who frequent Capitol Hill. And I can add that in my presentations of the various projects in which I am interested my personal experience has been similar. Though I have seldom received as much as I have asked for, I have never known a committee that was more earnest in its efforts to find the right answers to the very difficult problems with which it deals. I just cannot speak in too high praise or in words of greater respect concerning the gentleman and his fine committee for what I regard as an outstanding public service.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. He is very kind. I know every member of the committee will appreciate what he has said.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I, too, want to commend the chairman and the members of this subcommittee for the excellent work they have done. They visited many of these projects in the West. I know they came through my district, the Columbia Basin area, and were most diligent in attempting to see for themselves on the ground the various problems with which we are faced. I am sure they have done an excellent job.

May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that in connection with the Bonneville administration, which he discussed a moment ago, to a large extent, with very minor exceptions, the appropriations have been made that were requested by the Budget, and that will permit the Bonneville administration to carry forward its program without any deviation from its set program?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right; they will.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. This is a good bill, and I think the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Iowa is the chairman has done a very good job on the bill. They deserve credit, and I think they deserve the support of the House in the passage of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to add my word of approval of the work of the committee, especially what you did in refusing money for the building of transmission lines in the Southwest Power Authority. It was because of the action not only of this committee but your predecessor, and also when it was under the control of the Democrats, who refused to grant money for the building of transmission lines in direct competition with lines already established by private industry and serving the area, that I introduced legislation to compel the Federal Government not to go into the private power business but to sell power, either at the bus bar or at the dam, to private industry wherever that was possible, and, if that was not possible, then, and then only, should the Federal Government transmit the power to the interior and to the consumers. So I commend the committee on this action in that respect and approve of the comment the gentleman from California has already made.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It is very gratifying to me to note that the committee has allowed $1,000,000 to initiate the program of exploration and investigation of the fishing resources of the Pacific. A total of $1,500,000 was requested, and I assume the committee was well advised in reducing that total. However, I trust that as this program develops additional funds will be allowed. May I say to the members of the committee that the development of the fishing resources of the Pacific offers greater promise of profit, with the revenues that derive from it, for the maintenance and development of the new island areas that are coming under our control, than does any other industry that has been projected. May I say, therefore, that, in my opinion, the committee has shown real foresight in providing the funds that are necessary to start this program.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I also should like to add my word of appreciation for the consideration and courtesy the committee exhibited to me and other Members of Congress from New England in connection with the matter of funds for the rehabilitation and repair of the fish hatchery at Nashua, N. H. I commend the committee on the courtesy, patience, and zeal with which they have approached this work.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I notice in the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project which we are trying our best to complete just as quickly as possible, which project, as the gentleman knows, was started 10 years ago, that the total appropriation you have granted us is $19,750,000, when we asked for $23,000,000. The only question I have in mind is that if we proceed as rapidly in 1948 and 1949 as we did in 1947 in the construction of the project, which rapid progress was due to favorable weather conditions last fall and during the summer, and also by the reason of the fact that we could get the equipment much more cheaply than before, as I say, if we proceed as rapidly as we did a year ago, we possibly might need more funds to keep the work going and also to keep it going at a rapid rate. What would be the attitude of the committee in regard to a deficiency appropriation if it was absolutely necessary to keep the work doing?

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, in answer to that question, I can only say that every member of the committee, I am sure, will be anxious to give consideration to any reasonable request, whether it be for funds or what not. For us to promise you at this time that we would allow or could allow a supplemental appropriation is beyond the scope of our authority. I will say this, however, that if you should run out of money, and it is proven that the work has been carried on according to law and that the Antideficiency Act has not been disobeyed, and if we feel you have a good contractor who is doing a good job and that you are getting your money's worth and will get your money's worth in any supplemental estimate that we might allow, then certainly the committee is not going to stop the progress of any project, but will naturally act in harmony with good business practice.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is aware that during the last year two deficiency appropriations were made. At this particular time I want to thank the gentleman and the entire committee for the attitude they have taken on these two deficiency appropriations. Our work did not stop. Our project is nearing completion. We are on the last 50 percent to 35 percent of construction, and we hope that it will go much faster than the preceding work. We do appreciate the attitude and help of the committee, and I want to thank the chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. In closing, may I say that the amounts we have allowed for reclamation in this bill are, in our opinion, the amounts that can be spent judiciously during the year 1949 without disrupting the labor supply and the material supply of the country. We think we have given all the money that can be properly expended in such a way that we will get 100 cents on every dollar spent for construction.

Mr. HILL. If I may make another statement, I should say that our people in Colorado are more than happy to have had an opportunity to show you that project first hand last summer after the Congress adjourned. All of us appreciate very deeply the fact that you inspected it and looked it over and know what the possibilities will be there to add greater production to that valley when this project is completed.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. Your people and all the people of the West treated us royally on the trip, as they always treat people when they visit that great section of the country where folks are still rugged individualists.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Did you have a feeling that we were trying unfairly to influence you or bias you?

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, you did the best job you could.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the members of his committee for the remarkable piece of work they have done in bringing out this bill. Personally, I want to thank the gentleman for all the people of the great State of Iowa for his constant effort to save money for the taxpayers, and at the same time bring out necessary projects.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank my colleague from the great State of Iowa.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I, too, want to congratulate the committee on this bill. There is one matter I would like to take up with the gentleman at this time. I refer to the Boysen Dam in Wyoming. I do not know who to blame for the predicament that we find ourselves in at the present time. I cannot place the blame on the committee, to any great degree at least, because of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget did not ask for sufficient money for this project. While that dam is constructed in Wyoming it will benefit both Wyoming and Montana. As the gentleman knows, it is a multiple-purpose project including flood control, power, and silt control. The silt-control features will benefit lands in Montana.

I was out there about 2 months ago and looked over this project. The contractor has done an admirable job. He is a year ahead of schedule on the construction of the project at the present time. He was fortunate enough to get a subcontractor who had just completed a nearby highway contract the day after he got this contract. In addition he had good weather conditions all winter long.

Now, here is the situation: The Bureau asked for $6,108,000. The committee cut off the $108,000 and allowed $6,000,000. But to carry on that work this fiscal year we need $9,300,000. I think it would save the people of this country money to give us the additional $3,300,000 because of two factors. In the first place, if we get this project completed a year ahead

of time, we will have power that we need badly and of course the revenue from the power will start repayment just that much sooner. In the second place, the Bureau of Reclamation presently has a big force supervising this project, and we can relieve them and let them go to work somewhere else.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question. It seems to me it is just good sound common sense and also good business judgment for this committee to entertain a supplemental request for this additional $3,300,000. I think the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget ought to send that request up as soon as possible. I do not think you want to stop a project that is going along in such splendid shape. With that additional appropriation the contractor can complete the project by December 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say to the gentleman, of course we appreciate the fact that he is always fighting for projects in his State, whether it be for the cattlemen, the sheepmen, the farmers, or what not. But there is a limit to all things, as the gentleman knows. The reason we cut but very little off of the Boysen Dam is the simple fact that the contractor has gone forward fast and can spend this $6,000,000 judiciously. I do not know whether he can spend any more than that judiciously or not. If he can, and you can make a good case next year, or at any time after the first of the year, as I told my good friend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. I am not asking for requests for deficiencies or supplementals, because I do not like them a little; but there are times when they are justified. If the gentleman can justify additions for the Boysen Dam, fine.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman. I am sure that this is one project that will pay dividends to the people of the country by speeding up its completion. It seems to me that it is imperative that additional funds be provided during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and the majority members of that committee. They were very gracious and granted the minority members all the time they wanted to interrogate any witness who appeared before the committee. I am very appreciative of their courtesy. Generally speaking, I think this is a good bill. There are some things in it with which I do not agree and to which I shall call attention.

It was my privilege this past summer to drive through 31 States of this country, during the course of which I went into seven or eight Indian reservations. That is what we called them when we set certain lands aside many decades ago, to take care of these original Americans. I drove through the heart of the Navajo Indian Reservation, and there I saw little girls 8 years old who probably did not get to their homes more than once in 3 weeks, guarding sheep or moving wherever they saw a blade of grass. They followed the grass, and these children stayed out on that desert 3 weeks at a time, with rattlesnakes and other denizens of the wild as their only companions.

In the southern part of Arizona, out on that bleak reservation, in an area 95 miles in extent, there was only one doctor and one nurse. Two hundred and forty-five children out of every thousand die at birth on this particular reservation. It was also my privilege last year when I finished my investigations in America to go to Europe. There I visited eight or nine concentration camps.

I challenge any Member of this House, this Congress, or anyone in the country to show me a concentration camp in Europe—and I think I visited the worst of them—that was not better than an Indian reservation. Every one of the concentration camps had an inspection service, several doctors and nurses, and anytime anyone was sick there was medical care and attention right within the enclosure. But down in Arizona in a 95-mile area on the Navajo Reservation there was only one doctor and one nurse. As you will see from reading the hearings, the Indian Commissioner testified that there was one little hospital on one reservation—or concentration camp—for the Indians. The sick and ailing dragged themselves over the desert country for weeks, suffering from cancer, tuberculosis, or other terrible disease, crawled to the hospital, only to have the doctors and nurses shake their heads and say, "We are sorry, we cannot admit you." That is America. I am for admitting the DP people into this country. I will vote for such a measure if it comes to the floor of the House; but I think it is high time now, after more than a hundred years, that we do something for the Indians, that we do something for them besides setting up an Indian Bureau which keeps a close account on how many Indians are born, how many die every day, and reports to the Congress that this is what happened and this is what is going on now. We should take the Indian, the real American, and move him onto some of this land we are irrigating and give him a chance to survive. But, no. We even cut this bill $9,000,000 for the Indian Bureau. We cannot even keep track now of what their sufferings are. It is pretty near time that we stop, look, and listen.

Down in the Southwest, they have cut out all of the money from the bill for construction of power. Just think of the courage a man and woman would have to have to go down into the Southwest and establish or build a home. Today only 50 out of every 100 have lights in their homes in the State of Oklahoma, probably not that many in Texas; yet just 4 years ago only 29 out of every 100 had lights in their homes in Oklahoma. That was the situation until this Government decided to go into the power business and to give the people lights.

But now this bill stops all construction down in the Southwest country. You would think from reading this bill that 50 out of every 100 having lights in their homes is a sufficient number. In the late war we destroyed three nations—Germany, Italy, and Japan—three nations that were 95 percent electrified. Ninety-five out of every one hundred had electricity in their homes. In this great country of America today only 54 out of 100 have electricity in their homes. What a curse, what a shame on this great Nation.

Yes; I am opposed to that language in this bill about labor. Stop and think now of that language, if you will. If any man belongs to a union where the head of the union fails to sign a loyalty pledge, that man or woman cannot be paid out of these funds. We put that in there to stop communism, but if allowed to stand, we destroy Americanism. What do we mean by that? Let us say I worked on the railroad. I am a young man 20 years of age. I hire out on the railroad and join a union. To make sure I will not be a public charge or that the Government or society will have to bury me, I take out an insurance policy for my wife and myself to have protection at least for a decent burial. After 20 years' work on the railroad I am called in for a medical examination of my eyes and I fail to pass the test. I am discharged from the railroad. I cannot give up my insurance policy that I have paid for 20 years. It is much harder and more expensive to take it out at that age in an insurance company. So I get a job working for my Government. Let us say I work 20 years for the Government. Now they come along with a bill like this, after I have paid insurance for 40 years, saying that if the head of the union I belong to fails to sign the loyalty pledge, I cannot be paid out of those funds, or I must spend one year in jail and be subjected to a $1,000 fine.

Is that Americanism when you take out an insurance policy and have paid on it during 40 years? I repeat, I have paid for this insurance policy for 40 years in order to have a decent burial. At the end of 40 years you say I have got to give up that insurance because it is affiliated with the union, or quit my job with the Government. Is there any man in this Congress who will tell me that this is Americanism? Yet we have that rider right in this bill striking at labor.

Oh, yes, my memory is not so short that I cannot look back to 1902 when a miner would go to work in the dark, work all day, slave in a mine, in the dark, and come home in the dark. When they were on strike for 8 hours a day, when they were striking against dealing in company stores and all like that, oh, the howl that went up in that year, 1902. They yelled they were anarchists, and that they want to destroy the American Government. That was the howl of that day.

My memory is not too short but that I can remember in 1912 when they organized the IWW. They called them, "I won't work's" or wobblies just because they wanted an 8-hour day on the railroads on which men were being killed by the hundreds. But they got the 8-hour day 4 years afterward, in spite of men like Vanderbilt who said, "The public be damned."

My memory is not so short but what I can look back to 1919 and the steel strike.

I remember Judge Gary, the steelmaster of that day. The strikers then were

called Bolsheviks, because they asked for an 8-hour day. They were working 12 hours a day and 24 hours every other Saturday. Yes, this same Judge Gary gave a dinner at Paris for 12 guests and his wife and the cost was $75,000. The dinner was served on gold plates. But when the men wanted to strike for a decent living wage and be able to go to church even on a Sunday, just 1 day a week, Judge Gary said they could not have an 8-hour day; that it was not feasible and he called them Bolsheviks when they wanted to strike for their rights. But, they got that 8-hour day, not through the Congress and not so much through the unions. They got it through the Federated Churches of America, to which they will be forever thankful. Even President Harding had a hand in this reform, something that he was never given credit for.

Yes, my memory is not so short that I cannot remember 1932. That is the only time that they did not tab dissatisfied people Bolsheviks. I remember sitting in a moving-picture theater back in 1932. I saw the picture of a sheriff in Iowa who had a rope around his neck. The mob was about ready to toss the rope over the limb of a tree, and they said, "We will hang you if you ever sell another farm for taxes on the courthouse steps. And, I remember 1937 when they killed 19 people in front of the steel mills in Chicago and wounded several hundred others. That was the day the Congress of the United States went into action after they saw the moving pictures. That was the time the Congress created good law by amending the Wagner Act.

I can remember the year 1945 on the floor of this House when, after the Battle of the Bulge, many people here wanted to blame somebody for that disaster. What did they do? They tried to put the blame on labor, and they came into this Congress with an act known as the work or jail bill. That act was rushed through. There were only about 14 Members who voted against that bill, although Tom Dewey and Franklin Roosevelt said just 6 months prior that labor had done the greatest job ever done in the history of the United States, and yet some Members of this House wanted to put them in jail. After it got over to the Senate, cooler heads prevailed and the measure died.

But here we are again today, coming in with a rider on this bill. Yes, we are on the march again to destroy labor. We want to put them in jail for 1 year because they do not want to give up an insurance policy that they paid for over a period of 40 years, with the only other alternative of quitting the union. Now, I hope when the amendment is placed before the House today that in their wisdom the Members will see this proviso in the right light and will either strike out that amendment or correct it with another amendment. There are things about this bill that I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee on. Yes, they have added $112,000,000 more than we gave them last year, but I again say I object to cutting down the amount requested for the Indians. We should have enough funds to place them where they rightfully belong, and that is on one of the first irrigation projects in this country, and we should continue to do so until every Indian in this country takes his rightful place in society. This he cannot do today, for as long as 15,000 out of 22,000 children on the Navajo Reservation do not have the opportunity to go to school. They are still being treated as second-class citizens. I hope and pray that before the House passes this bill that they will take out that language discriminating against labor and that the Committee on Public Lands should find some way and that the Committee on Appropriations should appropriate sufficient money so that the Indians will have a proper place to live.

Mr. DONOHUE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the entire committee for the extended time and energy they devoted to the consideration and preparation of this bill; I particularly wish to express my appreciation of the courteous treatment accorded me when I appeared before the subcommittee, last April 15, to urge their favorable recommendation of an appropriation to modernize the Federal hatchery at Nashua, N. H. It is personally gratifying to note that this measure includes a designation of $30,000 for the Nashua hatchery.

I feel that the committee very wisely understood the subject of an adequate appropriation to expand our fish-rearing facilities is of tremendous importance to a great number of our citizens throughout the country.

In these days when we are calling for all Americans to support a gigantic foreign reconstruction program, which imposes severe burdens upon our people, I know you will agree that we should devote real attention not only to their recreational needs but also to providing additional livelihood opportunities. I earnestly believe that the members of the fish and gun clubs and associations throughout New England and the United States make a major contribution to the stability and tradition of our American way of life.

With reference to the New Hampshire hatchery, I want to inform my colleagues that this facility has, in recent years, been vastly overtaxed in trying to meet the requests for pond stocking that they receive. I would like you to know that the present fish-rearing system there was installed in 1898, and, since that time, it has not been possible to make any real improvements. The expansion program proposed would increase the rearing capacity of the hatchery from 150 to 200 percent. Using modern equipment, a 1,600-cubic-foot raceway, would produce as many fish as the present obsolete 16,000-cubic-foot raceway without the necessity of increasing manpower.

This hatchery is vitally necessary to the welfare and support of the people in that area. In view of the undisputed fact that it is one of the most important stations in the country, is one of the oldest, and that existing facilities are antiquated and deplorably inadequate, I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. I am sure that when the improvements, made possible by this initial grant, are revealed, the committee will next year approve the additional $55,000 needed to complete the modernization of the Nashua hatchery.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] a member of the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has done one of the most thorough jobs in connection with the Bureau of Mines that has ever been done in this Congress.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to say that it has been a privilege to serve on the subcommittee of the Interior Appropriations Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. He has at all times demonstrated his fairness to witnesses appearing before our committee and has shown great knowledge of the problems confronting it. His experience, gained over the years that he has been on the committee, has tended to ease the burden of those of us who have not served that length of time on this committee. I want to also pay tribute to the rest of the gentlemen serving on this subcommittee for the spirit of cooperation shown during our deliberations on this bill. At no time, that I can recall, was any partisanship shown and the conclusions that we have reached in this bill will, I believe, attest to this fact.

Your subcommittee held continuous and exhaustive hearings for over 3 months. In addition to the hearings, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. SCHWABE, and myself spent 7 weeks last fall visiting various Interior Department projects in the West. Mr. STOCKMAN visited Hawaii and Mr. KIRWAN toured the West. In addition, Mr. SCHWABE also held hearings and visited Indian Bureau projects in Oklahoma, while I spent 10 days during August visiting Bureau of Mines facilities in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Alabama, and Tennessee.

In other words your committee has tried to familiarize itself with the problems of the Department of the Interior; with your problems, and also with the taxpayers' problems.

Now I realize that there may be some disappointments in the amounts that we have appropriated but I can assure you that the Committee has endeavored, at least to be fair.

The chairman has gone into the details of this bill at great length, particularly with regard to the Bureau of Reclamation. I shall not burden the committee with anything further on reclamation at this time. However, I would like to say that Reclamation, generally speaking, is doing a good job although there is room for a lot of improvement. The projects visited by us are enormous in scope and when one witnesses the tremendous amount of work that is being done and what is contemplated being done in the future it causes me to wonder if there is any end in sight.

The Missouri River Basin with its contemplated projects—including the great dams under construction by the War Department—will ultimately cost this government many, many billions of dollars; the Columbia River Basin in Washington and Oregon has already reached an enormous sum and will ultimately mean an outlay of billions of dollars. The Central Valley of California will add to the load already burdening the taxpayers. The Colorado River projects are something to behold and of course will all add up to the terrific amount of money that this government will bear.

I do not mean to imply that they are not necessary expenditures or that they are not worthy projects. Rather do I wish to emphasize that they are in the main necessary and very worthy projects.

It was our privilege to see how, with irrigation water poured on, otherwise worthless land was transformed into highly productive soil. No one can object, or should object, to such a program.

The hydroelectric power features in all those projects while highly desirable in many instances, in many areas I might say, should proceed with caution lest we find ourselves taking out of circulation one of our sources of revenue which has been a factor in making this country of ours so great. Already we see signs of private enterprise capitulating to governmental opposition in business. Already we see sections of this country that have been served by private enterprise for many years and that would continue to be served by them, if given an opportunity, having their property seized by condemnation procedures and stripped of their property. This may seem inconsequential to some but to me it is an entering wedge that might easily extend its tentacles into other fields of endeavor and which could ultimately resemble socialization. So I say that we must take a good look from this point, and unless the people of this country desire this kind of procedure to continue, then we will have to continue to scrutinize all projects very carefully.

Those projects which will benefit the country as a whole—those projects that are really necessary in certain areas for their development and which cannot be undertaken by private initiative should have assistance. But, private industry where it wants to continue and is willing to help and do its share should not in my humble opinion be seized and unceremoniously thrown out of the picture.

Of course, most of these great projects, and they are great, generally speaking, are multiple purpose endeavors and are important in this sense in a great many instances. Certainly flood control which saves life and property is essential; most assuredly projects that can supply water to communities where it is necessary; recreation facilities when it is feasible; assistance to wildlife and game where it can be done, is all commendable.

I would like to comment on a great many of these individual projects; especially, those that we have personally visited. In the interest of time I will hurry along. Suffice to say that I saw and learned much in our recent visit to reclamation projects as well as other Interior Department activities. It helped me understand a great many of the problems which confront us in this bill.

My particular function relating to this bill, however, is with the Bureau of Mines items and the Health and Welfare of the Indian Service and the Alaska Native Service. I have given a great deal of thought and time to these phases of the Interior bill.

May I say right now that I believe that the Bureau of Mines is doing a very fine job. I believe this bureau enjoys the confidence of most of the membership of this body. And, in my investigations and examinations of their various facilities I found the same courteous and efficient type of personnel that we have always been led to believe existed.

In 1948 we appropriated $16,285,800 for the Bureau of Mines.

The Bureau of the Budget for fiscal 1949 recommended $22,692,300.

The amount recommended by your committee is $19,194,900. This is an increase of $2,909,100 over 1948 and a decrease of $3,497,400 under the budget estimate.

Analyzing these figures and the justification for them, after full hearings and deliberations, and observations on our trip, we think them to be in line with reason and properly evaluated.

Amount allowed, no change.

First. Salaries and expenses: $164,600; increase of $2,100.

This item is the same as last year with the exception of an increase of $2,100 for within-grade promotions.

Included in this item is $62,700 for printing and binding, which will only cover the cost of printing, and so forth, of the Mineral Yearbook, published annually by the Bureau. This yearbook has to be printed, according to law, and will cost about $45,000 this year. The remainder of this item money will be used up by administrative printing—such as costs of forms in the conduct of the Bureau's business as well as subscriptions to the Patent Office Gazette, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Federal Register, and required civil-service material. This work consumes most of all of the fifteen or twenty thousand dollars left in the item after payment for the yearbook.

Nothing is left for the publishing of the technical papers or reports which is really the duty of the Bureau imposed on it by statute, so that separate printing items should occur under various headings and obligations rather than in a blanket appropriation. However, in the mine-inspection and synthetic-fuel items for appropriations there is specific authority for printing.

Therefore this year will be a departure from the usual blanket appropriation item for printing and each item will be covered individually.

Second. Operating rescue cars and stations and investigating of accident:

1948 and base for 1949	$1,148,000
Within-grade promotions	17,000
Budget, 1949	1,165,000

The amount asked for in this item is the same as 1948, plus $17,000 for within-grade promotions.

This is one of the original and most important functions of the Bureau of Mines. It has to do with the promotion of health and safety in the mineral industries such as coal, metallic and nonmetallic mining, natural-gas production, petroleum production and refining, quarrying, and the metallurgical industries.

The work done in the health and safety division was authorized in the Organic Act of 1910, and reemphasized in 1913. This was brought about—in fact the creation of the Bureau of Mines in 1910 was brought about—by the terrible prevalence of coal-mine disasters in the United States. In the 5-year period from 1906–10, inclusive, there were 84 coal-mine disasters which took the lives of almost 2,500 miners. It was for this reason that the Federal Government was obligated to try and reduce this terrible slaughter of almost 500 lives each year occurring in 17 yearly disasters.

Since the inception of the Bureau much improvement has been shown in the disaster record at both coal and metal mines. In 1946 only two major disasters occurred in the coal mines of the Nation with a loss of 27 lives and none have occurred in the metal mines.

However, in 1947 there was a lapse in the steady downward trend of accidents in the coal mines and unfortunately six major disasters occurred with a loss of 179 lives. The worst disaster since 1926 occurred in 1947 when 111 lives were lost at the Central Coal Co. mine at Centralia, Ill.

Of the 179 deaths in 1947 in the coal mines 146 occurred in the bituminous mines and 33 in the anthracite mines. A table on page 343 of the hearings itemizes where all these disasters occurred.

So far in 1948, we have had only one major disaster, on February 8, 1948, eight men lost their lives at an Arkansas mine.

The Bureau of Mines contends that all these accidents were avoidable. Numerous very careless mining practices were disclosed by various investigative bodies, and certainly we trust that all the miners who have lost their lives in those disasters will not have died in vain if the safe operation of coal mines can have renewed impetus in the application of preventive measures—measures that have been advocated by the Bureau of Mines for many years.

The work of the Division of Health and Safety of the Bureau and its benefits have achieved world-wide recognition. In its efforts to promote health and safety in the mineral industries and carry out the mandate of Congress the Bureau has established two basic concepts:

First. Research and investigations, both field and laboratory.

Second. Educational activities of various kinds.

In the research and investigation field the work is carried on in the laboratories and experimental mine at Pittsburgh, Pa., and Bruceton, Pa., respectively. These facilities have done such remarkable work in the advancement of health and safety that they are renowned not only in the United States but throughout the world.

The field investigations are conducted by the Bureau's engineers, scientists, and

inspectors and cover various phases of operating conditions in mines, mills, and industrial plants of the mineral industries. The primary objective of such investigations have been to improve health, safety, and efficiency of operations through appropriate recommendations and suggestions. These are available to the public either in published form or by inspection of their files.

The record of the educational activities in the Bureau of the Safety Branch show that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, that almost 28,000 persons employed in the mineral and allied industries were given full courses in first-aid to the injured—2,424 in mine rescue—and since the founding of the Bureau 1,675,000 persons have received such training. Men in coal mining, metal mining, cement, quarrying, metals, rock tunneling, petroleum and natural gas, nonmetals such as mica, salt, gypsum, limestone, fluorspar, and clay.

Under the Safety Branch 10,000 people have completed the accident prevention course for coal mine officials and an additional 5,500 received partial training. Since the adoption of the Federal Mine Safety Code as part of the current bituminous coal mine wage contract several thousand additional mine workers have been or are being given instruction in safe work practices.

Likewise the Health Branch carries on much of its fundamental research on matters of health not only in the laboratory but also in the field of mines, mills, and industrial plants.

Its investigations cover the occurrence and prevention of disease caused by airborne dusts, fumes, mists, the effects of high temperature and humidity on underground workers, the occurrence of toxic gases and their effects on workers; methods of detecting gases and methods of protection against them.

The health branch tests respiratory protective equipment for safety and efficiency and the requirements for the health branch's schedules for permissibility are now standard for such equipment not only for use in the mineral industries but for virtually all industrial uses.

About 25,000 samples of mine air, toxic gases, and airborne dusts are analyzed each year and its services are extended to our armed services.

Other activities coming under this item are the Fuels and Explosives Division which has to do with testing explosives, explosive research, gas explosion research, Diesel engines, experimental mines and dust explosions research, coal mining methods and practices.

Coal mine inspections and investigations:	
Appropriations 1948	$1,875,000
1949 budget estimate, $2,895,000, committee recommendation 1949	2,431,000
Increase over 1948	586,000

This increase is for 50 additional mine inspectors, plus.

When the Coal Mine Inspections and Investigations Act was inaugurated—act of May 7, 1941, Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress (55 Stat., 177)—it was thought that 250 inspectors would be required to efficiently inspect the 14 to 16 thousand coal mines, large and small.

There are presently 200 mine inspectors and they have asked for an additional 100. The committee acceded to an additional 50, because it was thought that this number was all that could possibly be trained and utilized for fiscal 1949.

According to the Bureau of Mines representatives a recent survey shows that we have in the United States about 9,338 bituminous mines and 327 anthracite mines.

With the inspectors they had in 1947 they inspected for fiscal 1947, 471 anthracite and 3,514 bituminous mines for a total of 3,985 mines.

With the additional 100 inspectors they stated that they were desirous of inspecting all mines twice a year that employed 25 men or more, and, all mines employing less than 25 men once a year.

It can be readily seen that it is quite a task to get around to all the various mines, especially the smaller ones. But when the smaller mines, those with less than 25 employees, those that produce 4 or 5 percent of the coal of this country, contribute 7.1 percent of the fatal accidents it can be seen that they, too, are in need of inspection service.

In 1947 there were 179 men killed in 6 major accidents, by major explosions, of which 146 were in the bituminous and 33 in the anthracite mines. Up until the present time for 1948 there has been one major accident in Arkansas when 8 men lost their lives.

But that is only part of the story of fatal accidents in coal mines. There were 1165 killed in all the coal mines in 1947—990 in the soft coal fields, 175 in the hard coal fields.

If you will refer to page 345 of the hearings you will find a table classifying these fatalities and giving the causes of the accidents. I have mentioned the number killed by explosions, but a glance at the table will show you that explosions are not the No. 1 cause of most of the fatalities. In fact explosions over the past several years are in third place. Falls of roof and accidents along haulage ways are Nos. 1 and 2 respectively, as the main killers of miners.

So we have asked the Bureau of Mines to concentrate on all those phases of their inspection work so as to cut down to a minimum the fatal accident.

So much for the fatal accidents.

Now what about the nonfatal accidents? Take a look at page 344 of the hearings and observe the annual toll. It is not a very pretty picture to look at, and furthermore for the period 1944 to 1947 inclusive, there does not appear to be any diminishing of nonfatal accidents. In 1947 there were 63,000 men mutilated, more or less—51,000 in the bituminous, 12,000 in the anthracite. In fact over the 4-year period from 1944 to 1947 there was an annual average of 60,710 men injured nonfatally.

Again falls of roof cause a high percentage of these accidents.

So we trust that cooperation between the Federal Mine Inspections, the unions, State mine inspections, the operators and the workers that this annual toll of fatal and non-fatal accidents will decrease. It can be done, I am sure, and I hope that 1948 and 1949 will lead the way.

Anthracosis and silicosis—miner's asthma—of which I have seen a great deal as a physician, can and must be cut down in its incidence. I know that with all the research that has been done on this phase of mining, and if the recommendations that have been given by mining experts in regard to proper ventilation, wetting down dusty particles and using various types of masks were heeded, that there would be a reduction to a great degree of these cases—especially the severe cases. And I am sure also that were the Membership of this House privileged to see some of these cases of miner's asthma that you would agree that every effort should be made to control it. When you see the average miner, his lungs clogged with coal or rock dust, you see a man 40 to 45 years of age—an old man. Surely with cooperation this can be reduced.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am particularly interested in the gentleman's questioning of Mr. Krug as it appears on page 113 of the hearings of April 29, about the stock pile situation. I am very glad the gentleman brought that question up in the hearings to give us the Secretary's report in very short form of the total inadequacy of our stock piles of strategic and critical materials. While I know that comes outside of the gentleman's committee except as far as appropriations are concerned, I am deeply appreciative of the gentleman's interest. I know it is based on a long study of the matter from our common experience on the Committee on Military Affairs in years gone by.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate my good friend and able colleague. He has made a very fine statement about the miners and coal industry. His interest in coal mining and the miners of Pennsylvania is well known. It is most commendable. He has always been interested in the welfare and well-being of the people of the coal industry of our great State of Pennsylvania.

The miners of Pennsylvania have and are making a great contribution to the industrial prosperity of our State. In World War I and World War II they mined the coal that kept the wheels of industry turning and brought us great victories. They have earned and deserve our hearty commendations and I compliment my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], for his interest and work in championing all legislation for benefit and welfare of the miners of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I appreciate the gentleman's kind remarks.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

Last year the committee allowed three million for this item. At that time there was a carry-over of $6,000,000 and they had asked for an appropriation of

$7,000,000 which would have made a total of $13,000,000. So that what they actually had after our appropriations was $9,000,000 for fiscal 1948.

However, the construction of the plant at Louisiana, Mo., progressed to such an extent that they were able to keep up with their program and by April 15 of this year they found that in order to keep going and bring the plant to completion on schedule, that they would have to have a supplemental of $4,000,000. They received this supplemental so that they will have expended the full $13,000,000 on schedule.

You will recall that this was to be a 5-year program. So that at the end of fiscal 1949 the program will have ended. However, a new authorization passed the Congress this session for an additional $30,000,000, Public Law 443, March 15, 1948.

To date under the original authorization they have spent:

1945	$5,000,000
1946	7,000,000
1947	5,250,000
1948	13,000,000
Total	30,250,000

For fiscal 1949 they are asking $9,750,000. The committee was of the opinion that the best they could do would be to spend $7,250,000. However, if it is found that it is necessary to have more they can secure another supplemental. This will be quite possible because they were unable to contract for the Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant which would cost four to four and one-half million dollars—under the original authorization of $30,000,000. They, however, since the new authorization, have signed a new contract for this Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant which, if installed in fiscal 1949, would take up a great deal of the $7,250,000 which we allowed.

I might say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of this program. I saw their laboratory installations at Pittsburgh and at Morgantown, W. Va. I also saw their work at Rifle, Colo., and the work being done at San Francisco, Calif.

Now what about this synthetic liquid-fuel program? What is the necessity for it? Those are questions you might ask and are entitled to know since already $60,000,000 has been authorized to explore its possibilities. Where are the greatest sources for synthetic fuels? And what progress has been made up to this point? I believe if you will refer to pages 410 to 418 of the hearings, of volume I, you can secure the answers to those questions.

FIRES

You will note that the prevalence of mine fires was drawn to the attention of the committee. It has developed into a serious condition and millions of tons of coal are being wasted by mine fires.

A survey made by the Bureau of Mines shows that there have been reported 146 mine fires raging in the coal mines of this country and Alaska. Some of them are actually existing for many years—58 of these fires are on the public domain, 1 on Indian land, 8 on State or county lands, 79 on private land.

We think that something should be done about these fires—especially those in the proximity to towns and cities where the fumes of the gases are a hazard to the lives of the inhabitants, as well as to the destruction of property. There are several of these fires, presently, threatening communities. Incidentally, most of these fires are in abandoned workings, with the ownership disclaimed.

The committee has determined to try and do something about them and has included an appropriation of $250,000 in this bill.

MINE WATER, ANTHRACITE

The committee also increased the item of $105,000 in the anthracite mining investigation item to $396,100—an increase of $291,000 to implement a survey of the mine-waters situation in the anthracite region.

The membership of the House will recall that it passed H. R. 4837, a bill introduced by me for a survey of this water problem which threatens to ruin the whole industry. The bill has not been acted upon in the Senate, as yet. However, since the bill passed the House the Interior Department has been advised that there is no need for more authority. This information was not given until weeks after its passage in the House.

You will find on page 1041 to 1052 of the hearings a full account and justification for this survey.

The committee, therefore, has included in this bill $291,100 to initiate the survey program which will be concluded in 2 years.

Not only are the anthracite reserves threatened to be destroyed but the lives of the anthracite miners are in constant jeopardy, and I fear that a disaster may occur at any time. Just recently three men in my district were caught by a rush of water which broke through to the place where they were working. Fortunately two of them were rescued after being closed in for days. The third man was lost.

LIGNITE LABORATORY

Pursuant to House Document 624 under authority of Public Law 454 of the Eightieth Congress, the committee considered the estimate of $750,000 for the construction of a laboratory to do research work on lignite.

The committee was informed that the entire amount would not be necessary for this year. We, therefore, recommend that $200,000 be appropriated for fiscal 1949 with a contract authorization for $550,000 for construction next year.

TESTING FUEL

In this item the committee allowed the budget figure of $506,600, an increase of $106,600 over this year.

This increase allows $10,000 for experimental work on the bituminous coal to supplement the already diminishing coking coal. Such coal taken from Illinois, Kentucky, and Ohio, not used now for coking, will be experimented with by blending with good coking coal of Pennsylvania, eastern Kentucky, and West Virginia, and still get an adequate metallurgical coke.

This is absolutely necessary for the continuation of our steel industry—especially since we are considering a national security program.

This work has been going on, on a limited scale but with this additional money they can pursue the work on a more adequate scale. Something like 100,000,000 tons of coking coal is required for the steel industry annually and the Munitions Board has requested the Bureau of Mines for information as to our coking reserves so as to evaluate the Nation's ability to maintain iron and steel production over any period of emergency.

In addition to experimenting for new good coking coal the rest of the money in the appropriation goes into research on coal utilized by our Government facilities. The Government uses about 5,000,000 tons of coal annually at an expenditure of about thirty-five to thirty-seven million dollars so that economy is necessary and the best coal obtained.

Research is also done on combustion of coal, coal preparation, coke and gas making properties and byproducts.

Research is also being done on lignite and sub-bituminous coal in the areas where these fuels occur, while the research that I mentioned before is done at Pittsburgh.

Research is also done on boiler-corrosion. This research is estimated to save the Government $30,000 a year; with an estimated valuation of $300,000,000 worth of steel equipment in the Army alone this item is invaluable.

MINERAL MINING INVESTIGATIONS OTHER THAN FUELS

The budget requested $428,300 for this item which is a decrease of $12,000 under the current amount. The committee allowed $403,300.

An analysis of obligations by activities can be found on page 429 of the hearings.

INVESTIGATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC MINERAL DEPOSITS EXCEPT FUELS

This item represents investigations for some of the critical minerals we need. Particularly, chromium, vanadium, titanium, copper, lead, and zinc.

The committee allowed $1,560,000 which is $500,000 more than the current year of $1,060,000 but $190,000 less than the budget estimate.

COAL INVESTIGATIONS

The committee allowed $300,000 or an increase of $225,000 over the current year of $75,000. The budget request was $350,000.

This increase is due to the research on coking coal and a survey to be made of such reserves. A member of the Munitions Board appeared before our committee requesting this item and made a statement in justifying it. This statement can be found on page 441 of the hearings.

OIL AND GAS INVESTIGATIONS

This item is in the amount of $606,000 which is the same as last year's appropriations plus $6,000 within grade promotions.

The committee allowed the full amount and it has to do with secondary recovery research at Bartlesville, Okla., Dallas, Tex., Franklin, Pa., Laramie, Wyo., and San Fransico, Calif.

MINING EXPERIMENT STATIONS, EXPENSES OF

This item of $1,385,000 is an increase of $385,000 which the committee allowed in full.

The increase is due to $50,000 being appropriated for the existing station at Seattle, which is equipped to do research on coal and nonmetals.

With the shortage of oil in the Northwest, and very little work having been done on coal, it is the intention to try and develop that phase of fuel use, since they are converting from oil and gas to coal. It is estimated that there are 11,000,000,000 tons of coal in Washington, but not all is recoverable. However, with an estimated valuation of equipment of two to three hundred thousand dollars in the laboratory, we think it is only common sense to use it. On page 459 of the hearings you can find a long list of industries who request information from the Bureau of Mines on the coal problem which shows the interest in the possibilities of its development.

Also in this item is $250,000 for the construction of a station in Alaska. There is no metallurgical personnel or laboratory in Alaska, which, as everybody knows, is a vast area of mineral potentialities—metal and nonmetal.

A list of the various mining experiment stations and their allocated appropriations can be found on page 456 of the hearings. And on pages 463 to 471 the functions of these laboratories and their accomplishments.

METALLURGICAL RESEARCH AND PILOT PLANTS

The budget request of $1,895,000 is an increase of $895,000 over the current year. The committee allowed $1,460,000, an increase of $460,000 over the current year of $1,000,000, but a decrease of $435,000 under the budget.

The money appropriated for these pilot plants is only done on the most useful things developed in the experimental stations. Hence, the work this year will be on iron and steel, which is a broad term, and includes all the materials that go into iron and steel—like chromium, vanadium, tungsten, or manganese.

CARE, ETC., BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, PITTSBURGH, PA.

The Bureau of the Budget gave an estimate of $142,300 for this item, which was the same as the current amount.

During the hearings and from my personal knowledge it was developed that the fine property the Bureau has at Pittsburgh and Bruceton were deteriorating, due to lack of funds.

The committee requested a statement outlining the extent of the deterioration, together with an estimate of what it would cost to start to recondition. A statement was submitted in the amount of $229,000. The committee saw fit to allow $175,000 of this amount, or a total appropriation of $317,300.

ECONOMICS OF MINERAL INDUSTRIES

The committee allowed the full amount of the budget estimate of $708,500, an increase of $28,500 over the current appropriations. Of this increase, $9,500 is for within-grade promotions and $19,000 for mineral-industry surveys.

HELIUM

This appropriation is the same as the current year, $90,000, plus $1,000 for promotions in grade.

ALASKA NATIVE SERVICE HEALTH

The total appropriation for the Alaska Native Service is $4,518,962, which includes $2,080,268 for the conservation of health program. In the health program there is an increase of $729,268 over the current year.

From the testimony that we have heard the past 2 years from the Indian Service medical men and the medical director of Alaska, together with a report from the AMA convinces me that we should make an all-out attack on tuberculosis in that territory.

That tuberculosis is on a rampage in Alaska there can be no doubt. It has been pointed out by Dr. Bernstein, who headed the AMA commission; by Dr. Snavley, of the Indian Service; and by Dr. Albrecht, the Medical Director of Alaska, that the tubeculosis death rate in Alaska is 360 per 100,000, as compared to 40 per 100,000 in the United States, or a death rate of nine times that of the United States. The native death rate is 16 times that of the United States.

It is estimated that there are 4,500 cases of TB in Alaska.

The AMA commission which investigated health problems last summer has made a comprehensive and thorough report of the conditions they found. The full text of this report can be found in volume 2 of the hearings, pages 929 to 944, inclusive.

It simply confirms the testimony of Dr. Snavley, of the Indian Service, and Dr. Albrecht, of the Alaska Health Department, who had come before our committee the past 2 years. Dr. Arthur Bernstein, the chairman of the commission, appeared before us and gave us a verbal report of their findings.

As a medical man I am amazed at what these medical authorities told us. I want you to read the report of the AMA commission and their conclusions, if you will, please. I for one am concerned about it.

Now when you stop to consider that tuberculosis is a disease that is infectious and transmittable and therefore controllable it becomes a disgrace. Especially since we have had jurisdiction over Alaska since 1867 when we purchased it from Russia for $7,200,000.

Tuberculosis can be prevented and if those who are presently charged with the duty of health matters in the Alaska Native Service are incapable of reducing tuberculosis they should be supplanted by those who can and will. This Government has expended a great deal of money for this work and I for one will not charge our Government with being to blame. They have appropriated money, and a great deal of money. Perhaps not enough; but, if I were charged with the duty and my advice was not followed, I would get out and perhaps someone else could be more persuasive.

I believe that the Department of Health of Alaska, under the direction of Dr. Albrecht, is trying to do a job; but there is a limitation of funds from the territorial government. He has made many fine recommendations along the lines suggested by the AMA commission, and if given the financial aid I believe he would succeed in his efforts.

Dr. Snavley, of the Indian Service, is familiar with this problem also. But if he cannot carry out what he knows to be the right answer then it is time for some other Federal outfit to be in charge.

Here we have three medical groups—the AMA, the Alaska health authorities and the medical head of the Indian Service—all in accord as to what should be done, and the tuberculosis problem and its terrific incidence and death rate goes merrily on. Perhaps the answer would be to completely take the health department out from under the Bureau and place it in competent medical hands. The United States Public Health Service, I believe, would clean up the mess.

At any rate, I have suggested to our committee to permit funds as recommended by the AMA and Dr. Albrecht, to establish temporary isolation units to be utilized in conjunction with existing hospitals until permanent institutions can be erected. I was successful in getting half of their request in the amount of $550,000. Also $25,000 for our cooperation in the social service hygiene which the Territory has just taken over; and $174,000 to provide for approximately 74 beds in the Seward Sanatorium.

Take a look at the report of the AMA on Alaska and glance at the text of the hearings on this whole subject. The eye conditions, the venereal rate, the number of crippled children caused by TB, the sanitary conditions, and you will actually shudder.

Every one of the conditions that are so prevalent can be controlled and must be controlled if Alaska is to be our left flank defense to say nothing of our ability to do the right and proper thing.

INDIAN HEALTH IN THE UNITED STATES

I almost hate to start on this item. However, what I shall say is with reference to the Navajo Reservation and the Hopi Tribe.

Here again we find an almost unbelievable situation right here within our own borders.

During our hearings at Window Rock, Ariz., on October 21 last year—and you will find an account of this hearing in volume 2 of our committee hearings on pages 680 to 700—you will discover to some extent what is taking place.

Now I realize that the Indian Bureau has been given the task of administering to the Indians. But whether it is the present outfit that comprises the Indian Service or any other group, I do not see how they can do the impossible. You just cannot have sanitation or health where you have a poor supply of water or no water at all. You cannot raise cattle or crops in sufficient quantities to sustain an overpopulated area where you have no water.

You just must be satisfied with a high mortality rate and a high morbidity rate if this Government insists on doing the same things year after year in their Indian programs.

The babies will continue to die before they reach 6 months or a year in age if a proper and adequate supply of milk and good water is denied them. And tuberculosis will continue to soar in prevalence if sanitation is not established.

I see only one solution to the Navajo problem and the Interior Department can have all the 10-year plans they want; if they do not supply water, the appropriations we expend will not be used to its full advantage. And if they cannot supply water, and I do not believe they can, then there is only one thing to do, and that is remove them from, or for the most part at least, the desert.

Now I am not condemning the 10-year plan as such. It has a lot of good in it. But, I repeat that from what I saw it is not right to keep on kidding ourselves and the taxpayers that you can establish good health conditions when nature has decided against that area.

If handling the health problems of Alaska and the Navajos is any indication of what governmental medicine or socialized medicine will do, it will just be too bad for everybody in America.

As a medical man I am actually ashamed of the administration of health problems. Perhaps the United States Public Health Service could do a better job than the present outfit. I would make that recommendation to our Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from one of the great Indian districts of our country, I am naturally interested in appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I am proud to say that in my congressional district reside two of the greatest of the Five Civilized Tribes or, for that matter, two of the greatest of all the Indian tribes, the Choctaws and the Chickasaws. The contribution which representatives of these tribes have made to my own State of Oklahoma and to the country would fill volumes. Members of these tribes have distinguished themselves in peace and in war and in every walk of human life. I am proud indeed to number them among my constituents.

I am particularly interested in the matter of Indian health and education. Located in my district at Talihina, Okla., is one of the finest hospitals in the United States—a hospital which is capable of taking care of over 300 patients. This hospital is situated in the beautiful hill country of southeastern Oklahoma, and the buildings which comprise this institution befit the surrounding territory. The hospital is modern, well equipped, and staffed by a group of conscientious, patriotic public servants. This institution is performing a magnificent service for the Indians and for the community and area in which it is located. I sincerely hope that this appropriation bill when finally enacted into law will contain sufficient funds to keep this great hospital in full use at all times.

I am also interested in Indian education. In my district are located three of the great Indian boarding schools. These are Wheelock, Carter, and Jones Academy. Jones Academy serves young boys, and the other two schools serve young girls of Indian descent. These schools offer to these young people, in many instances, their only opportunity to obtain an education. These boys and girls come from remote places; some of them are orphans; some of them come from broken homes. Located also in my district is the Indian Goodland Orphanage a, very fine institution indeed. It has been my pleasure to visit with students from this school, and I am proud to say that one of my most prized possessions is a photograph of the outstanding girls' chorus which has been developed at this institution. I am happy that the Federal Government has seen fit to give financial aid to this institution, although it is in reality, an orphanage under the supervision of the Presbyterian Church, a church which has done tremendous good through the years in working among the Indian population of Oklahoma.

Also located in my district are a few day schools operated by the Indian Bureau. These schools are situated in places where State schools are not available. In addition to this, the Federal Government has made provisions through the years for tuition payments for Indian children attending local and State schools. These functions are an important part of our Federal activities and I hope on final passage that ample funds are made available in this bill for these necessary functions of our Government.

I am also happy to state that a number of men representing the Indian Bureau are stationed at various points in my district, performing daily services for the Indians. Most of the offices to which these individuals are assigned are understaffed, and I am happy to learn from the Appropriations Committee that it is the intention of Congress in this bill to make ample provisions for field agents, clerks, appraisers, probate attorneys, and other officers and employees functioning at the service level.

WESTERN MONTANA PROJECTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to note that the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations has recommended that approximately $12,000,000 be appropriated for projects in my district. I am hopeful that the Senate will raise this figure to the amount I have consistently advocated for the 1949 fiscal year, the sum of approximately $20,000,000.

The following Montana projects have been allowed the sums noted for the fiscal year 1949:

Hungry Horse project	$8,100,000
Canyon Ferry project	2,750,000
Indian TB hospital, Galen	750,000
Three Forks project	214,000
Jefferson River project	75,000
Helena Valley project	15,000
Flathead extension lines	200,000

All these projects are of great importance to the people of my district and the State of Montana. In January 1948 I found out that the Bureau of Reclamation had requested only $5,000,000 for the Hungry Horse. In view of the fact that over $6,000,000 had been spent on preconstruction work on and transmission lines for the Hungry Horse, I felt that this amount was entirely inadequate. I called the Bureau of Reclamation and pointed out that the Hungry Horse was almost ready for construction and that an appropriation of $20,000,000 should be requested. As a result of my insistence, the original request of $5,000,000 was withdrawn and a new one forwarded, with a request that $9,850,000 be appropriated. Furthermore, after the hearings were started and bids called for on the general contract, I again contacted the Bureau of Reclamation and requested that they ask for a supplemental appropriation of $7,000,000 for fiscal year 1949. It is my understanding that such a request has been sent down by the Bureau of Reclamation, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and will be considered by the Senate committee when this bill reaches that body. I intend to do all that I can to see that this extra amount is granted so that the appropriation for this coming fiscal year will be $15,000,000, instead of the $8,100,000 appropriation allowed today.

As the author of the Mansfield bill authorizing the Hungry Horse, and as the one who has had to carry the fight for this project against the Montana Power Co. for the past 5 years, I am indeed happy that the interests of the people of Montana have once again won out. With a general contract of approximately $43,000,000 already let for the construction of Hungry Horse and approximately $15,000,000 already appropriated or in process of being appropriated now, the building of the Hungry Horse is definitely assured and the future of western Montana thereby benefited. I want the Congress and the people of Montana to know that I am proud of the progress of this project and the part I have played in bringing it to this point. The Hungry Horse is the first step in the development of Montana, and its construction marks the beginning of an era in which our State will be developed for the benefit of our people.

The amount of $2,750,000 appropriated for the Canyon Ferry Dam is a step forward in the building up of Montana. It is my hope that the height of the dam will be considered in the Senate committee and a decision arrived at which will be fair to all parties concerned.

The welfare of Montana's Indians is met in part by the appropriation of $750,000 for an Indian tuberculosis hospital at Galen, Mont. I had asked that the full $1,500,000 authorized under the Mansfield bill be allowed, and I hope that the Senate will allow the full amount of $1,500,000 when this matter comes before that body.

It is my intention to appear before the Senate committee and ask that the full $9,850,000 plus an additional $7,000,000 be allowed for the Hungry Horse; that $3,500,000 be allowed for the Canyon Ferry project; and that the full $1,500,-

000 be allowed for the Indian hospital at Galen.

The committee has also allowed $214,000 for the Three Forks project, $15,000 for the Helena Valley project, and $75,000 for the Jefferson River project. These are important developments in Montana's future and they spell a livelihood for our children and an opportunity for all our citizens.

Montana is now making the first step toward an assured future. I intend to see to it that the process is continued so that Montana can be developed for the benefit of Montana's people. This they deserve, but they have had to wait a long time for it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I am particularly interested in the item on page 39 which provides $3,000,000 for general investigation of proposed reclamation projects and related matters. For the past several weeks I have been conferring with the Department of the Interior in the hope that it could use some of its current appropriation for the purpose of investigating a proposed reclamation project on the Canadian River in my district in Texas. I am wondering if the gentleman can assure me that part of this money will be used for that purpose?

Mr. GORE. I, too, am very much interested in that particular part of this bill. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman upon his diligence and concern over this problem as it relates to his home people and also to the Nation as a whole. One of the very serious problems looming up in the Nation is the depletion of the underground water supply. I have learned that in the area which the gentleman represents this is an increasingly acute problem. It is for the purpose of making investigations into threatened areas such as the gentleman makes reference to that this item is in the bill. This money is recommended to the Congress by this committee, and it is my understanding—and I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to corroborate my opinion—that the subcommittee recommends to the Congress the making available of this appropriation for the specific purpose of conducting an investigation of such problems as the gentleman raises here.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to say that I understand that to be the fact, and I am glad to say also that the gentleman from Texas, who has asked that this matter be taken up at this time, has explained to me the great need which prevails in his district for such an investigation. Certainly, I think the investigation should be made, and if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Tennessee, I would like to see the necessary funds utilized out of this amount which is provided in this bill for investigations in the gentleman's district in Texas.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman. It is not only agreeable to me, but it is the desire, as I understand, of and the intention of the committee, that certain of the funds herein be used for that specific purpose.

Mr. WORLEY. I thank both the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Tennessee. I can assure both of them and the House that there is no project more important to the Texas Panhandle at this time than the possibility of erecting a dam not only for flood control and irrigation, but particularly providing a water supply for industrial and municipal purposes. I am very glad to have the assurance you gentlemen offer that a good and sufficient portion of this fund will be devoted to that purpose.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman for raising this point which otherwise might have escaped my attention in the brief time which I have to address the committee.

This question of underground-water supply is not only important from the standpoint of industrial use and of a supply for municipal water systems, but as the underground-water reservoir is depleted and sinks, the amount of subterranean irrigation for plant life is lessened, and one of the problems which will increasingly demand the attention of this Congress in the future is that very one.

Before going further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation for the friendship existing between the members of this subcommittee. The distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has labored long and diligently. For many, many weeks we have been sitting long, long hours daily studying the many problems affected by this bill. The distinguished gentleman has been thoroughly fair and considerate of the minority Members as well as his colleagues on the majority. As I indicated a few moments ago, the able and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] specialized in the operation of the Bureau of Mines, the inspection of mines, and other phases of mining, and has done an excellent and thorough job. The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] has done, I believe, the most thorough job of investigating and studying the problems of the Indian Service that I have seen done in my 10 years in the Congress. The membership may not find themselves in full agreement with all the recommendations of the subcommittee in this regard, but I do not think it will be challenged any place, from any source, that the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] has done a very thorough and exhaustive job in conducting the hearings and the investigation into this subject.

For that service to the Congress he is to be congratulated and now has my congratulations. Likewise, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], in the particular field in which he took the leadership, has shown himself to be diligent, thorough, broad-minded, and constructive.

We members of the minority have served as a backstop. Our opinions, though they have not prevailed in some of the fundamentals of the bill, have, I think, been taken into consideration. Upon most points in the bill, though in some cases reluctantly, we find ourselves in agreement.

There is one basic question upon which there is a fundamental difference of opinion. The difference of opinion on this basic problem is in no way personal; indeed, it is much bigger than that. The point of difference to which I refer is one of divergence not only within the subcommittee but, as has been shown by the record, within the Congress and to some degree within the entire people. However, I must confess my confidence that a majority of the people find their sentiments differing from the sentiments of the present majority of the Congress on this question.

The point of basic difference to which I refer relates to electric power. Immense amounts of the people's money have been expended in the construction of hydroelectric dams, yet from the budget, from this bill, has been eliminated every facility which would make available to the people and to their own cooperatively owned agencies the power generated from these dams. I do not charge anyone with being improperly influenced. Indeed, I have strong confidence that such has not happened. Nevertheless, that is a question which this Congress must decide, and, I dare say, which the people will be asked to decide come November. This is the old bus bar philosophy by which, even though the people's money in huge amounts has been invested to build these enormous generating facilities, the people are denied the benefit of their own investment except that they pay toll to the private power companies.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that under this bill as written it would be impossible for any of these projects acting through the Bureau of Reclamation to sell power directly to a city which owned its own power distributing system?

Mr. GORE. Does not the gentleman understand that to be true?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what I understand from the report; yes.

Mr. GORE. I think that is spelled out more in the report than in the bill. But in evaluating the report, it must be recognized that the report of a congressional committee, though not entirely binding upon the agencies as having the effect of law, nevertheless, binds the agencies morally. I know of no agency that violates a congressional committee report.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That applies not only to a city but to every other kind of public body, such as utility districts, reclamation districts, or any other public set-up, is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is my understanding.

Of course we know that a small REA cooperative cannot build a million dollar substation. We know if we build huge dams, even if we go as far as we have in the Southwestern Power Administration, to tie dams together with high tension lines, if we deny the facilities to bring that power down to usable form but on the other hand, make it available only to private concerns which can invest the huge sums that are necessary to take the power from the bus bar or from the high tension line, that means that the small REA's, the municipal systems cannot get it except by paying

a toll to the power companies. Does than answer the question of the gentleman?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, it answered my question in part. I wonder if the gentleman would yield me some time so that I may discuss this matter?

Mr. GORE. I assure the gentleman that I will yield him some time and I congratulate the gentleman upon his interest. We of the minority stand ready whenever the Members from the West will sufficiently arouse themselves to fight this monstrous thing that is being done to the people of the West—let me repeat—we stand ready to march shoulder to shoulder with you.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] for the purpose of discussing this question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss a statement in the report on this bill. It reads as follows:

None of the funds in the bill and no funds heretofore provided for switchyards are to be used for the construction of a switchyard at Elverta or for the construction of any switchyard facilities at Tracy not required for the operation of the project pumps, and any other funds allocated by the Bureau for these purposes are to be reallocated for continuation of construction of facilities for which funds have been specifically appropriated beginning with the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. Chairman, I want to try to spell that out in one particular case. We have heard it said that all of us who believe in public power are Socialists and that we are this, that, or the other thing. I think if you will study the history of the Reclamation Service, you will find that an integral part of the development of reclamation has been the development of power, and that the electric power generated is generally turned over to public agencies such as cities, utility districts, and so forth.

In this statement it provides that nothing can be used for switchyards or substations. This is the way that will work out: The particular transmission line referred to above goes from Shasta Dam on to a city called Tracy. Elverta, on this line, is a place where they have a switchyard. Within a few miles of Elverta is the little town of Roseville. The people in that town sat down and developed and bought a municipal distributing system. The city is operating a distributing electrical system. There is nothing new, there is nothing novel, there is nothing radical in that. In fact, the very city where the Speaker of this House lives has an electrical distribution system, municipally owned.

The effect of this provision is that this little city of Roseville cannot buy its electricity directly from the Reclamation Bureau. I do not know whether the committee realizes what they have done when they did this or not, but this is what they have done: They have virtually said that all of the electricity developed at Keswick and Shasta Dams—and it is a tremendous amount—shall be distributed through a private utility.

I have not come to my conclusions on this matter in any hurried manner. I have been involved in these matters for over 20 years. That means that this private utility, which is one of the best managed in the United States, will reap the main benefit from this vast investment; the features concerning flood control, fish control, navigation, and all those things have been written off. First, the Reclamation Bureau sells the power at a profit to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Then the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., at a profit, naturally, sells it to the little city of Roseville, and it sells it to its consumers. That means that in the municipal utility district of Sacramento, organized by the people of that district, voting bonds by a 75-percent majority, will have to buy their electricity through a private utility. In other words, there is a pyramiding of two profits before the consumer gets the use of this electricity, when for the consumers' benefit the utility district should be able to buy the juice directly from the Department of Interior.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What is to prevent your own city buying it at the bus bar? It does not have to buy it from the private utility company.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. A little city like Roseville cannot run a line up to the bus bar.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the Government builds a transmission line to the city limits, it can then take it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What is there in this bill that prevents that?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The point about this bill is that you cannot buy it directly from the Reclamation Bureau. That is what I think would make the biggest public benefit and the greatest profit to the public, because you are going through two pyramids of profit from the power plant to the consumer, when one should be sufficient. When the private utility takes this power, they say they pay large local taxes. All they do is increase their rate, and the consumer pays the tax bill through the utility rate. The consumer, in fact, pays these taxes in higher electric rates, but he does not realize it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. May I ask what the reference to the bill is that prevents buying by the municipality? The gentleman said there was a definite reference in the bill that prevents that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Frankly, I cannot find that reference in the bill, but it is in the report. It is a policy that the committee is directing the Reclamation Bureau to place in its administration of the facilities, namely, not to allow any substations, switchyard facilities, and so forth. This means that small cities, who cannot build a line to the powerhouse, cannot get this juice.

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

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say it has been a privilege and pleasure to work with the members of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations in preparing this year's bill. The committee has worked in complete harmony at all times during the extended hearings of approximately 3 months. At no time was there any major disagreement among any of the members of the committee on either side of the table.

I believe the bill which we have brought to the floor today for your consideration is one of the best bills that could have been prepared, considering the differences of opinion that exist among the membership of the House in the various amounts asked for, for work on the projects in their different districts.

I believe the bill merits the approval of the House.

I had the privilege of handling the hearings on the Territories Division of the bill. It seemed to me that probably the two most important items in Territories were the extension and reconstruction of the Alaskan Railway and the highway system in Alaska. Lieutenant General Craig of the Army testified before the committee at considerable length upon the importance of the extension and furtherance of the highways and railroad in Alaska and it met with the approval of the committee to go ahead with this work. We consequently authorized the approval of $13,500,000 for highway construction in Alaska and $15,000,000 cash and $6,700,000 in contract authorizations for the Alaska Railroad.

The Alaska Railroad runs from Seward to Fairbanks and is the only railroad in Alaska. It is an important arterial connection between the inland area and the coast.

Hawaii, as one of our territories, presented no special problems that required undue consideration by the committee. Their problems as presented to the committee were mostly the same as they had been in previous years and the committee had no trouble taking care of them.

We did authorize an item of $1,000,000 for the construction and operation of two fishery research vessels which will vitally affect industry of Hawaii, in my opinion. It was brought to the attention of the committee that there were vast schools of fish in the far western Pacific Ocean about whose habits we know very little, how many there might be, what their poundage might be, yet they are thought to be available for the taking. It seemed that the inclusion of this item would be of great value to the fishing industry both of the United States and Hawaii.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wish to say for the benefit of the Membership that we of Hawaii were very happy indeed to have the gentleman from Oregon as our guest for some 16 days last fall. I can say from personal knowledge that he devoted that time to a very thorough examination of our problems and therefore comes to this

aspect of his responsibility with a very complete knowledge of our needs. I wish to assure him that what has been done in this bill is very much appreciated by all of us in those islands.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his observations. Although I must say I think the item for fishery research vessels affects industry in the United States much more than Hawaii. I was very highly and favorably impressed with conditions in Hawaii during my stay in that delightful paradise of the Pacific last summer, and I wish to say that in my judgment the United States would be very highly benefited by Hawaii being made a State.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations made his introductory remarks I interrupted him to thank him for the kindly consideration given my constituents from Arizona. There were too many other items, in addition to water projects, for me to touch on all of them. I cannot touch on all of them now, and I will not repeat what I said previously.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to two items in this bill about which I am concerned. One of them was explained earlier by the chairman. That had reference to the maintenance of the All-American Canal. When I first picked up the report and turned to page 60 I saw an item there that disturbed me. The chairman did explain it, but I want to indicate to the House why I am concerned about that matter. This is at the top of the page:

All-American Canal—Operation and maintenance.

I noticed that the estimate for 1949 was $216,000, and in the last column it is indicated that amount was not allowed. However, the chairman tells me other provisions for it have been made, so that my worst fear was not well founded.

Mr. Chairman, my reason or laying great stress upon this work in another State may be a matter of curiosity to some as to why I am going to the west of Arizona and taking an interest in the All-American Canal. But the All-American Canal takes water out of the Colorado River at the west end of the Imperial Diversion Dam, whereas the east end of the Imperial Diversion Dam diverts Colorado River water from there into the Gila Canal on the Arizona side of the river. Those two canals lead from different ends of the Imperial Diversion Dam. Engineers tell me that that dam must be under one management and control. If you are going to divert water into California in the All-American Canal and into Arizona through the Gila Canal, it must be done by the same engineering management. I am not enough of an engineer to know why that is. However, that is a lesser point, although I want Bureau of Reclamation engineers to operate that dam.

The All-American Canal is a very large and very expensive proposition built with Government money and sponsored by the water-using farmers. I take off my hat to the farmers down there in the Imperial irrigation district who backed that canal. The canal is of tremendous importance in more than one respect. It is big enough that you can cause to flow continuously through it all of the average flow of the Colorado River; in fact, it is more than twice the size it needs to be for its legitimate load of irrigation water to California. Now, this All-American Canal runs from the Imperial Diversion Dam down to the Mexican border to a place called Pilot Knob. According to a treaty we recently made with Mexico we are going to put a certain amount of water for Mexico down through that canal. That is an international obligation in this water treaty. We are going to supply 500,000 acre-feet of water annually to Mexico through this All-American Canal. That is in the treaty, we must carry it out, as it is an international obligation but we must not let any more water go to Mexico than that amount through that canal.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that no private corporation in America, certainly not in Mexico, should have complete control of that canal, and especially not the Imperial Dam. When I first saw page 60 of this report, it occurred to me that the withholding of funds might cause the maintenance and the management of the All-American Canal and the diversion dam to pass to the Imperial Irrigation District. I do not want that to happen. It must not happen. We cannot afford to let any private corporation carry on this Government function under treaty with Mexico, for there would be plenty of opportunity for it to breach the treaty. I do not know that the Imperial district would deliberately breach the treaty, but there would be opportunity; in fact, I would say there would be great likelihood. That is why I am so concerned to have our Government control those works.

I have time and again called the attention of the Public Lands Committee to the fact that the All-American Canal is a great open faucet at the lower end of the southwestern water barrel—the Colorado River Basin—and we who are watching every precious drop of that water must watch how that faucet is opened and to what extent. There is evidence that somebody in southern California wants to turn it on full force and profit by wasting water belonging to five States.

Mr. Chairman, I note what the committee says in its report with regard to the business of the Bureau of Reclamation and that it is not, in the judgment of the committee, the business of the Bureau to build transmission lines from our great multiple-purpose dams. I do differ in that, but I will not quarrel with a part of that statement. I do not want the Bureau of Reclamation going into the distribution of power business. It must produce hydroelectric power because they cannot have big multiple-purpose dams without producing power to be used in irrigation and to help pay the total cost.

There is a tragic shortage of power in Arizona and my people are anxious to get power from Hoover Dam which is theirs by rights and under the law and they are very anxious to see the Davis Dam completed and in operation producing power. Arizona needs all of Davis power and all of her quota of power from Hoover Dam. But this power is not available now and will not be available to Arizona without transmission lines from those dams into Arizona. There is a part of congressional law in the Boulder Canyon Act that makes a unique provision concerning transmission lines into Arizona from the Hoover Dam and that unique provision has a bearing upon Government-built transmission lines into Arizona from Davis Dam. Apparently this bill does not adequately deal with that. I have never asked that the Government go into the distribution of power.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I will be glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman knows that this committee and the Congress has appropriated millions, in fact, hundreds of millions of dollars for transmission lines to load centers where people who want power can send their lines and get the power which they need right from the load centers.

Mr. MURDOCK. I commend that and ask for more of it for Arizona.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman is in perfect harmony with the committee when he says that he does not believe the Congress or the American people by taxation, by their tax dollars, should build a distribution system all over the country wherever power is needed; is that right?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right if I may modify it and make it clear to this extent: These big multiple-purpose dams are built up in the mountains, away off from centers of civilization or habitation. The power must be brought to the communities and to the farmers for pumping. Now, there is a peculiar case in my State. The Hoover Dam is many, many, many miles from any large city. Of course, it is connected up now with southern California by private transmission lines, which is all right, but Arizona is entitled to some of that power and those lines are not there. In this particular case Arizona has planned to build lines. The Davis Dam has not been completed, and there is a tremendous power shortage all through the Southwest. It is no greater in Los Angeles or southern California than it is in Arizona, relatively. There is a power shortage every place. Now, how are we going to get power from the Davis Dam to where it is needed? Oh, I know there are corporations, utilities, who would be glad to build the power lines, but since this is highly monopolistic business, that would mean a great and expensive dam to produce much needed power with only one purchaser. I do not believe, gentlemen, it is good public policy to build a great dam like Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Shasta, Hoover, Roosevelt, Davis, or any of them and permit only one customer to take that power. I do not believe that is good policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the gentleman that the United States should not go into the business of distributing power, but when they wholesale power they ought to do it on the same business principles that a private utility does; is that not correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And if you confine yourself to one customer, then you have no choice in the matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is exactly right. The general situation over there in the great Central Valley in California is very much like the one that I am disturbed about in Arizona. So, I want to bring that to the attention of Congress.

I want to commend the committee for what I think is generous treatment of the Indians, particularly the Navajo and Hopi Indians. I would have been glad to see even more done, especially for their education and for the building of roads, but the committee has done a good piece of work and I want to approve it, as well as the work of the legislative committee that has made the legislation possible.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and members of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for the Department of the Interior for bringing to the House this bill, H. R. 7605. The committee has been most diligent in its work in the long period of examinations in the field and extensive hearings and concluding work in preparing the bill for submission to the House. The chairman and several members of the subcommittee visited the Columbia River area in my congressional district in Oregon last year and made every effort to gain full information on the ground as to the needs of the various districts throughout the United States in the important fields of legislation under the jurisdiction of the committee. While it is true there are certain provisions in the bill and in the report to which I cannot give full support, on the whole the bill is a good one and should have the support of the House, as I am sure it will.

I am deeply interested in the appropriations for the Bonneville Administration, not alone because the Bonneville project on the Oregon side of the Columbia River is in my congressional district, but also because the whole problem of providing adequate hydroelectric power is a most critical one in this whole section at this time. While it is true in the Pacific Northwest we are critically short of hydroelectric power to take care of existing needs, the larger problem of finding adequate hydro power to carry on the rearmament program is becoming most serious. During the war the Columbia River area furnished 30 percent of the aluminum that went into airplanes and it was able to do so by reason of power supplied by the Bonneville Administration.

Last year when I appeared before the Interior Subcommittee I submitted load estimates applying to the third Oregon district, in which I pointed out approaching power shortages in the Portland area. After reading the record of the hearings before this committee and the Senate committee, I found that the load estimates I had worked out were closely substantiated by the testimony of the officials of the Portland General Electric Co. and other private sources. However, the experience during December of 1947 demonstrated that the actual loads in the Portland area exceeded all previous estimates. This area, in common with the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas in California, had the largest population growth of any area in the country, being some five times the national average in the period between 1940 and 1947. This accounts for the large increases in the Portland area.

Last December the House Interior Subcommittee increased the budget estimates on the supplemental submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation in order to accelerate generation at Grand Coulee, which is the pay-out portion of that project. The action of the House committee was later confirmed by a floor vote in the Senate, and the additional sums to accelerate Coulee generation were made a part of the last supplemental bill.

The situation in the Portland area is grave for the reason that there is not sufficient transmission capacity available to take this additional Coulee generation into the Portland area. This was the situation that the Senate committee uncovered from the testimony of the operating officials of the companies serving the Portland area and, in my judgment, was responsible for the observations contained in the Senate committee report.

Not only are we finding a deficiency in hydroelectric power in the United States but we are also facing critical shortages in petroleum products and coal. I addressed the House on May 10, 1948—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page 5531—on the question of the natural-resources development as the key to our national prosperity and defense. In my remarks I called attention to the immense potential hydroelectric power in the Columbia River area which is undeveloped and going to waste every year which, if utilized, would replace immense quantities of coal and oil now in scarce supply. I called attention to the fact that the potential hydroelectric power located in the Columbia River and its tributaries represents about 20,000,000 kilowatts, of which 18,500,000 kilowatts are now flowing to the sea unused. If this oil replacement were developed, the oil saved would be 290,000,000 barrels per year, or about 95 percent of the total European oil consumption, or close to one-quarter of this Nation's prewar consumption. We will be recreant in our duty if we fail to speed up the construction of the hydroelectric power generators in the McNary Dam on the Columbia now under construction and the Foster Creek, Wash., project which is only in the planning stage, as well as the Hungry Horse project in Montana under contract. I most sincerely urge that our conferees from the House in the consideration of the civil-functions appropriation bill for the War Department keep in the bill the items for the speeding up of two of these projects, namely, McNary Dam and Foster Creek Dam.

As I pointed out to the committee when the bill was under consideration in the House if the $40,000,000 is allocated to McNary Dam as recommended by the Army engineers, it will make possible the completion of the dam 1 year earlier than present plans and save the Government some $16,000,000 in revenue from the sale of hydroelectric power. While doing so, we will be receiving this additional power so vitally needed not only for advancing the economy of the Northwest but for providing power needed in the atomic energy plant at Hanford, as well as for producing the aluminum to carry forward our 70-group Air Force program.

To show the value of the development and utilization of this great pool of hydroelectric power in the Columbia River area I call attention to the equivalent values in coal and oil in short supply which must be used to replace the hydroelectric power now available in the Columbia River area, but undeveloped.

EQUIVALENT COAL

The United States production of coal in the calendar year 1947 was slightly over 600,000,000 tons of bituminous and subbituminous coal including lignite. During this year the production of anthracite was about 9.5 percent of the total production of the lower-grade coal, or some 57,000,000 tons, or a total of about 660,000,000 tons of all kinds.

In this year the power-generating stations of the United States averaged about 1.29 pounds of coal per kilowatt-hour. Therefore under an 80 percent loading, which represents average conditions in the Pacific Northwest, 1 kilowatt-year represents 7,000 kilowatt-hours. To produce the amount of power under average steam conditions would take 9,000 pounds of average coal per year. Consequently 1 kilowatt-year represents the equivalent of 4.5 tons of coal.

Following World War I, United States bituminous and lignite production reached a maximum of 569,000,000 tons annually. In the period from 1919 to 1929, this type of production ranged annually between 500,000,000 tons to 560,000,000 tons, with a low rate of 415,000,000 tons during the recession of 1921–22. During the depression of the early thirties this type of coal production dropped to 309,000,000 tons annually, or about 59 percent of the 1920–29 average. This type of production did not start upward again until 1936 and continued under 400,000,000 tons until 1940, when the annual production rate reached 460,000,000 tons. The peak war production of such coal reached about 619,000,000 tons in 1944.

The annual anthracite production in 1920 was about 90,000,000 tons. This has been gradually decreasing to 57,000,000 tons in 1947, with a low rate of 49,000,000 tons in 1932 and 1933. The war peak

anthracite production—63,700,000 tons—was reached in 1944.

The combined 1947 coal production was only 3.5 percent less than the war peak production rate.

From 1919 to 1946 very little of the United States coal production was exported, and during this period the amount of exports ranged from 3 to 6 percent of the national production. This is easily explained, as before the last war Great Britain, western Germany, Poland, and other contiguous countries were large coal producers. The coal production in these countries is now about 25 percent below prewar levels. Consequently United States coal exports in 1947 jumped to about 11 percent of United States production, or some three times the prewar level.

The United States coal reserves are large, and nationally we have no immediate worry in this direction. Normally coal is not stored at or near the pits. We can produce more than 660,000,000 tons annually if we had the necessary transportation equipment. Export demands will continue to be heavy until 1951. Our export limitations in the next 3 or 4 years will be imposed by the number of available railroad cars and the coal-handling facilities at eastern ports, and not by mine-production facilities.

In 1920 the United States national production of electricity amounted to 39,400,000,000 kilowatt-hours, of which amount about 21,000,000,000 was produced by coal, 2,800,000,000 by oil, gas, and wood wastes, leaving 15,600,000,000 representing hydro production. In that year a kilowatt-hour took 3 pounds of coal to produce.

In 1947 the national electric production jumped to 6.5 times the 1920 production, while the coal used in electric production only increased 2.5 times. This lack of proportion in increase results from greater steam efficiency, more hydro generation, and the large increases in use of oil and gas. In 1920, 12,700,000 barrels of oil were used annually by the power industry. This use jumped to 36,300,000 barrels in 1946. Practically all of this fuel-oil increase occurred between 1940 and 1946.

Let us now examine the coal equivalent represented by the potential hydropower on the Columbia, its trubutaries, and in areas adjacent thereto. With 7,000 hours' use per year the wasted, unused hydropower of the Columbia and its tributaries represents the equivalent of about 110,000,000 tons of coal annually. If this wasted hydropower were used in basic electro industries, the coal equivalent would be about 130,000,000 tons annually, or about one-quarter of the normal United States bituminous coal production.

The Bonneville plant output is the equivalent of 2,600,000 tons annually. The ultimate development of Grand Coulee and McNary represents 12,500,000 tons annually. Foster Creek and Hungry Horse together are the equivalent of 5,600,000 tons annually.

Therefore it can be conservatively stated that the unharnessed flow of the Columbia Basin in a year's time is the equivalent of around 100,000,000 tons of coal. In the not distant future the wastage of this undeveloped power will be classed the same as wastefully burning 100,000,000 tons of coal in each year.

EQUIVALENT OIL

On numerous occasions during the past 9 years I have addressed the House on the over-all resources problem, especially covering critical materials which could be produced in the electric furnace and the electric cell. A goodly number of these suggestions, especially the one offered before this Nation was involved in World War II, have been placed in operation and the experience throughout the war and since has been eminently satisfactory.

Today I intend to cover the national liquid and solid fuel situation, especially the former, as within the next 10 years this will become one of our most critical defense problems.

PETROLEUM RESERVES AND CONSUMPTION

According to the American Petroleum Institute the estimated proven petroleum reserves existing as of last year were 21,900,000,000 barrels. The increase in reserves per year resulting from the discoveries of new fields dropped from 511,000,000 barrels in 1944 to 244,000,000 barrels at the beginning of 1947. Ten years ago these national reserves were being increased at the rate of 930,000,000 barrels annually, through new discoveries. Such an increase is now dropping to the vanishing point, which means that this Nation will rapidly deplete its in-sight supply of oil.

The United States' annual rate of petroleum consumption in 1947 reached an all-time high, being in excess of 2,000,000,000 barrels. Just before the last war the world consumption of petroleum was sightly under 2,000,000,000 barrels annually, with the United States consumption being 60 percent of the world consumption, or about 1,500,000,000 barrels. The per capita United States consumption of petroleum products increased from 370 gallons in 1938 to 608 gallons in 1947, or an increase of 65 percent.

Since World War I, the United States has been exporting about 15 to 20 percent of its petroleum production, but with the increase in domestic consumption these exports have dropped to 8 percent of production. These exports are now about balanced by imports from the Caribbean and Mediterranean areas. Our imports are in the form of crude oil while our exports are the refined products. The reason for such a sharp increase in domestic consumption is due to several causes: First, our industrial production is at a high level with many modern processes requiring oil-heat treatment, thereby resulting in conversion from coal to oil. Our railroads are rapidly changing to Diesel locomotives from coal burners, and seven-eighths of all late locomotive purchases have been Diesels. The farm use of Diesel oil and gasoline in tractors and trucks has about doubled in the last 10 years. Aviation requirements of high-octane gasoline are rapidly increasing, and our automobile production rate is approaching the prewar rate of 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 new cars per year.

There are no indications that the present petroleum consumption rate will stabilize within the next 5 years, but as I see it, the consumption rate will increase. This Nation at present has only about 30 percent of the world's known petroleum reserves but we are consuming at home nearly two-thirds of the world's production. During the past winter the effects of oil shortages have suddenly become very pronounced, resulting in distress calls from many sections. The Nation's present petroleum demands exceed the war's peak consumption.

This Nation is now being placed between the two jaws of the mechanical vise which are being tightened by the screw of increasing domestic demands. No wonder Arabian oil is now receiving international attention. The stated proven reserves in the Middle East are 25 percent higher than the total like United States reserves, and geophysical soundings indicate that the most probable Middle East reserves will be double the present reserves of the United States. Such coundings further indicate that the greatest existing oil pool lies in the area of the Caspian Sea-Russian territory, and extends into and across the Indian Ocean into the East Indies.

Our usable refining capacity is now being operated at the highest obtainable rate, and the industry is making every effort to expand refining facilities. Everything possible is being done to increase refining volume, but this is the easiest part of the over-all problem. The petroleum industry is doing all possible to help in the solution of this problem.

The latest figures obtainable on European petroleum consumption indicate a use of 310,000,000 barrels annually, which is about 20,000,000 barrels less than the prewar use. Sixty million barrels are annually produced in Europe, and the same amount is imported from the United States. This represents only 3 percent of United States production—the remaining amount of European use comes from the Middle East and the Caribbean. European requirements will increase as conditions stabilize. Refined lubricants, although in tight supply in the United States, constitute our principal dollar value exports to Europe.

I call attention to the following pertinent editorial from the Washington Post:

OIL FOR THE FUTURE

Anyone who has been content to regard America's oil supplies as a problem for someone else to worry about will get a rude shock from the report of the special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. The report is so cogent and so rational that it ought to be required reading for every informed citizen. And it pulls no punches in stating that an immediate, comprehensive oil policy is vital to security, even though the policy make make necessary such restraints as oil rationing and steel allocations. As the committee phrases it:

"We want to give expression, frankly and without equivocation, to our view that the Nation is already guilty of half-hearted action in dealing with petroleum; that as a Nation we are living profligately today in our use of petroleum products; that we are providing inadequately for national defense at a time of great international tension; that early action is imperative, on a national scale, unless we wish to continue to jeopardize the national safety and render future generations

in this great country hostage to our own profligacy."

The blunt fact is that as a Nation we have become oil-happy. We are consuming now more oil than the entire world used in 1938; and last year we used 9 percent more oil than at the peak of the war. The great upturn in demand, the committee asserts, is due to two factors; the instruments for burning oil are increasing more rapidly than the facilities for producing oil, and there is a growing public preference for oil over coal for a variety of reasons, "not excluding the gyrations of the leader of the United Mine Workers."

It should be obvious that the United States is particularly vulnerable to a curtailment of its oil supplies, even for civilian use. This is even more true with respect to military use, for oil is the food for war. Yet, according to estimates, demand will outstrip domestic production by a million barrels a day in 1948 and 2,000,000 barrels a day in 1954. The committee suggests on the basis of precedent that we would be nearly 3,000,000 barrels a day short of war requirements. At the same time domestic oil discoveries are declining and excess production capacity no longer exists. The critical implications of this situation cannot be stressed too strongly as world tension forces us to augment our military strength.

The report shows clearly the vital relationship of steel to petroleum, for the present oil shortage is primarily caused by a bottleneck in steel. The committee is not overly sanguine about the voluntary steel allocation program. This program, the committee emphasizes, must "not be permitted to rock along if it gives evidence of being ineffective." The alternative is, of course, a mandatory allocation program directed at attaining so far as possible self-sufficiency in this country, and beyond that at developing sources in the Western Hemisphere and other areas. In this connection the committee also observes forthrightly: "within the next 6 months the Government must determine whether present efforts * * * to persuade the consumer to conserve oil will be adequate." If the voluntary program gives evidence of failure, "rationing must be imposed."

In this atomic age all our defense arms move on petroleum products. Therefore the preservation of our security rests on the maintenance of an adequate petroleum base. These conditions are therefore an enlarging source of worry to our Navy, Army, and Air Forces. With consumption doubling, new discoveries dropping at a rapid rate to one-fourth of values existing 10 years ago, and reserves being depleted, it is apparent that this Nation is drifting into an insecure position.

ENERGY SUBSTITUTES

Low-cost firm hydro energy is the best obtainable substitute, as it can produce a better industrial end product at a lower cost. Industrially the electric furnace or electric cell do not produce the flame contacts which result in lower metal and chemical grades, as when oil, gas, or coal furnaces are used. Further, the commercial and mechanical utilization efficiency of firm hydro power is much better than that of oil, which in turn is better than that of coal.

These facts lead to the natural inquiry: How many barrels of oil does a hydro kilowatt operating at a high-use factor for 1 year displace? The most efficient oil-burning generating station in the Pacific Northwest produces 440 output kilowatt-hours for one barrel of oil. The best, like plants in California produce about 490 kilowatt-hours. The highest possible commercial efficiency would give 535 kilowatt-hours. Therefore, 500 kilowatt-hours per barrel is a conservative round figure representing probable best practices. The hours use per year in the Pacific Northwest runs 7,000 hours, or what is known in the industry as an 80 percent load factor. The electro industries run above 8,000 hours per year. From these average use and modern relations it follows that 1 kilowatt-year of hydro power is equivalent to about 14 barrels of oil. The majority of industrial users find it impossible to reach the efficiency of the modern large generating stations. Consequently on a delivered individual basis, 1 kilowatt-year represents about 15.5 barrels of oil. Some of the older generating plants in the Northwest only produce 300 kilowatt-hours per barrel, or 23 barrels per kilowatt-year.

The Bonneville plant during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts, which is equivalent to 8,800,000 barrels. The 15-unit completed Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28,000,000 barrels of oil annually. When McNary Dam is completed the oil saving will be about 15,500,000 barrels annually. The existing usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts, and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions, 5,000,000 barrels will be consumed. From present indications it will be difficult to even secure commitments on 5,000,000 barrels, due to the tight situation on the Pacific coast. The potential power on the Columbia and its tributaries is around 20,000,000 kilowatts, and 18,500,000 kilowatts is now flowing to the sea unused. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be in round numbers 290,000,000 barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydro power in our future economy.

I have pointed out on many occasions that in the past 8 years we have become the storehouse for the world. In so doing we have depleted the resources that were considered to be on the shelves of this resource storehouse. It is therefore time that we began to fully consider the necessary corrective measures to maintain our national position. Today I am only considering the fuel components of the problem, but I want to call to your attention again the like situation in the electrochemical and electrometallurgical fields, which from the security angle is just as important as the petroleum situation which I have outlined.

Mr. Chairman, I again commend the committee for its tireless work and recommendation of the essential appropriations for the maintenance and continuation of the work of the Bonneville Power Administration and most sincerely urge that our conferees on the civil functions bill of the War Department make available the necessary funds to carry forward with all speed the construction projects on the Columbia River, McNary Dam, and Foster Creek Dam, in order that we may not find ourselves in the midst of a revitalized rearmament program without the hydroelectric power necessary to carry the program forward.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, once again I call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill now before us is the most important appropriation bill for Alaska on a day-to-day, month-to-month, and year-to-year basis. It is from the grants made under this bill and similar bills, past and future, that most can be expected by way of Government assistance to private initiative in contributing to the development of Alaska.

It gives me pleasure to say here that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and his fellow members have listened attentively to the presentation of Alaska's needs and have given those of us who appeared in behalf of the items in the bill concerning the Territory all the time and consideration we could have asked for. I want to congratulate the subcommittee upon the realistic approach to Alaska problems which is reflected by an examination of this bill.

It contains in all $32,879,595 in cash and $17,625,000 in contract authorizations for work to be performed in Alaska by the Department of the Interior in the next fiscal year. This would be $18,554,497 more in cash than was contained for the Territory in the Interior Appropriation bill passed last year.

Now, at long last, a really constructive program can be started in the Territory. I well realize that Alaska's strategic position is in no small measure responsible for the additions being made to the budget of the civilian agencies. Nevertheless, a road built this year because it is considered essential to national security will continue to serve a useful purpose in attracting and assisting in the maintenance of a larger permanent population.

When it is considered that Alaska at its most westerly point is less than 60 miles from Soviet Asia, the argument that we must proceed without delay to build up our northern rampart gains new weight. The long years of neglect by the Federal Government which Alaska has suffered reflect no credit on our national policy. I must say, however, that the bill now before the House is not only an acknowledgment of that, but gives testimony to the intention of the subcommittee to see to it that this condition does not continue longer.

It is not enough to maintain armed forces in Alaska not ony for the defense of that region but of the Nation as a whole. It is equally important that more settlers be attracted there, that industries be established and that businesses be created. In the main, that is bound to be accomplished by the American system of private initiative. Additionally, there is an absolute requirement for substantial contributions by the Federal Government of the very kind which are contained in this bill. By building more roads, by improving existing roads, by rehabilitating the Alaska Railroad, and by carrying on many other activities

spelled out in this bill, worth-while aid will be given to the pioneers of 1948.

Having said that the subcommittee has in many important fields taken action which is calculated to and will aid materially, I know it will not be inappropriate for me to point out a few items in the bill which I think could be improved to the advantage of all concerned.

First, I refer to the item for game-law enforcement. A budgetary request of $420,000 was made. The bill as reported out contained $175,000, precisely the same figure made available for this fiscal year. I submit there is urgent, even imperative, need for more money than this.

The wildlife resources of Alaska are now facing an emergency condition more serious than at any past time in the history of the Territory.

During the recent war, the Army constructed many aircraft landing fields throughout the Terrtory. In addition, the Army was primarily responsible for a great expansion of the highway systems of Alaska. The net result of these actions has been the opening up of thousands of square miles of virgin game, fish, and fur country hitherto inaccessible to man by favored means of travel. This construction work has caused an influx of thousands of nonresidents into the Territory in addition to the tremendous increase in Army and Navy personnel now stationed in various portions of Alaska.

Alaska, unlike the various States, cannot have a State conservation commission. The Federal Government is directly charged with the administration, management, and proper utilization of big game, fur animals, migratory waterfowl, and game fishes for an area of land approximately one-fifth the size of the United States. The tremendous increase in population in Alaska is endangering species of game animals, many of which are fund nowhere else in the world.

To cite a few examples of unusual game animals in Alaska, the big brown bear, the largest carnivore on earth, is found in relatively restricted areas in Alaska. Kodiak Island is well known for its brown bear population as is the Alaskan Peninsula and several of the islands of southeastern Alaska. Grant's caribou is found on the Alaska Peninsula. The Dall sheep has a quite restricted range in Alaska. Aside from the esthetic and recreational values inherent in the pursuit of these animals, their economic value is enormous. The harvest of beaver, otter, foxes, marten, and mink annually in Alaska is usually of greater value than the entire purchase price originally paid to Russia for this Territory.

As an example of the importance of the fur resources of the Territory, during the past trapping season, the value of the catch of mink alone which came into Ketchikan in southeastern Alaska was in excess of $400,000 .

The Fish and Wildlife Service has recently reorganized the administrative and enforcement set-up in Alaska. The 21 fisheries enforcement officers and the 9 wildlife agents have been instructed by the Director of the Service through the new regional director of the Service in Alaska to administer and enforce all laws pertaining to the conservation and management of fisheries as well as wildlife. This reorientation of duties and objectives by the entire group of law enforcement personnel stationed in the Territory will be more effective in conserving and properly managing these resources. Notwithstanding this reorganization, there are many areas in which, because of a lack of personnel and equipment, no effective management of wildlife or fishery resources can be possible. To husband and manage properly these resources, it is imperative that funds be provided for additional law enforcement officers in the Territory. For them to be effective, it is equally imperative that funds be provided by the Congress for the purchase of essential transportation items, boats, automobiles, and aircraft.

Further, the existing staff of Alaska law-enforcement officers cannot patrol their districts unless funds are provided for the replacement of transportation items which are now almost completely worn out. The present automobile equipment available for law-enforcement officers in Alaska is in every instance of prewar vintage. Unless funds can be provided to replace this equipment, these law-enforcement officers cannot be effective in guarding the resources charged to them. Motor launches and small river boats with outboard motors are needed, not only for the protection of big game and fur animals but to make possible the patrol by boat of vast areas in which migratory waterfowl nest and rear their young. These nesting areas in Alaska furnish most of the migratory waterfowl which are hunted on the Pacific flyway of the United States.

Funds are also necessary for the repair, maintenance, and operation of boats and aircraft in Alaska. That the wildlife resources of the Territory are being rapidly depleted is undeniable. Unless adequate and speedy action is taken, such big game animals as the white sheep—Dall sheep—and caribou, found nowhere else under the American flag, could become extinct within a short time. Other game, such as the giant Alaska moose and brown bear, are fighting a losing game in the battle for existence. Over one-half the population of the Territory depends almost entirely on fish and wildlife for their livelihood, and there is no one individual in Alaska who is not directly concerned with these resources.

Hunting pressure has increased manyfold due to the large increase in population, the increased use of aircraft, better transportation facilities, and the consequent availability for hunting of areas which had heretofore been inaccessible. Fur bearers, long the only source of revenue in a large portion of the Territory, are being rapidly depleted in a number of areas. Every citizen of the United States has a claim or interest in Alaska's wildlife resources, and they have a right to expect that these birds, animals, and fishes are being adequately protected and managed. The present value of Alaska's game animals, birds, and fishes, exclusive of commercial fishes, at present-day values may be estimated conservatively as being in excess of $100,000,000. The esthetic value to tourists, sportsmen, camera fans, and nature lovers cannot be estimated. From a standpoint of simple business practice alone, these wildlife and fishery resources are well worth an investment of several times the present appropriation.

It would have been helpful, I believe, if the modest item of $37,500 to be made available for a coordinating staff in the Division of Territories had been retained. For my part, I want to say the Division has been of greatest assistance. But it is understaffed and this relatively small appropriation could have been used most constructively.

I am concerned, too, about the subcommittee's statement regarding abolishment of the Alaska regional office of the Bureau of Land Management. Nowhere in the United States, I am informed, is there such activity relating to homesteading as in the Territory and the regional office there is serving a demonstrable need. We have found that governmental functions are always better served when there is a direct channel between the Alaska office and Washington, with the utmost local autonomy being granted Alaska officials. Whatever its name might be, I hope there can be maintained in the Territory an office serving a need which even an increased district office cannot fulfill and which is beyond the functions of that district office.

In concluding, I want to thank the members of the subcommittee from the bottom of my heart—and I know every last Alaskan would wish to join me in this—for the really magnificent contribution they have made in this bill aimed at removing the dread scourge of tuberculosis from Alaska. In addition to previous assistance given in this field, the subcommittee has now recommended the appropriation of $550,000 for the installation and operation of control units at various points throughout the Territory. Additionally, the subcommittee has approved contract authorization for $5,925,000. This will make possible the construction of a new sanitarium in southwestern Alaska. When this sanitarium is operating, when the control units have been established, and when the sanitarium at Sitka has been completed, we will then and at long last be in position in Alaska to control tuberculosis. The subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations will have the everlasting credit for having made that possible.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to the language contained in this bill on page 95, lines 11 to 14 inclusive, the words "or that such person is not a" on line 24, line 25, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 96 except for the word "Provided" at the end of line 3, all the words after "violence" on line 10 and all of lines 11 to 14 on page 96 up to and including "1947." This provision has become known as the Keefe Red-rider, and has previously been inserted in at least two appropriation bills passed by this House within the past month.

When we had the supplemental Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1949 under consideration last April 29 I said that I agreed with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in his efforts to rid the Government service of employees who were subversive to the best interests of the United States or members of the Communist Party. At that time the bill under consideration contained a rider such as the one contained in the present bill. Since then I have given this matter very great consideration, and my conscience has been concerned with the position that I then took. I am now convinced that in order to get at the Commies we would be unnecessarily punishing a number of loyal Government employees.

Today, after hearing the illustration given by my distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] wherein he depicted a situation in which he as a member of a labor union, paying dues for many, many years, would have to give up all his rights and the payments made all those years toward a death benefit, and after recalling to mind the illustration given by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] when we previously considered this matter in connection with an appropriation bill, I must frankly say that I feel that I was wrong and am now in favor of deleting this Keefe rider from the bill. I have discussed this matter with a number of the members of this committee and trust they will take such action.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman will be glad to know that after full consideration of this matter pertaining to the language which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWIN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], and other Members of the House on both sides of the aisle have objected to, and after this subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations has fully considered the force and effect of this language to which the gentleman objects, we have agreed and decided that, during the reading of the bill for amendment, when that paragraph is reached I shall submit a unanimous-consent request that the language which has been so strenuously objected to be deleted from the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I appreciate very much the decision of the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the subcommittee, and feel that he is taking a commendable position in this matter. If we are going to help to rid organized labor of some Communist leaders we must do so by some means other than this rider.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am very glad that the gentleman from New York brought out that particular part of the bill, which in my opinion is uncalled for and which certainly infringes upon the civil rights of government workers and which furthermore brings out the idea of guilt by association to such an extent that it would result in thousands of innocent people being contaminated because of the wording contained in this subsection. I am in favor of striking out all of lines 11, 12, 13, and 14 on page 95, line 24 containing the words "or that such person is not a" all of line 25, page 95; lines 1, 2, and 3, page 96, up to and including the numerals "1947"; all the words after "violence" on line 10, all of lines 11 to 14, page 96, up to and including the numerals "1947."

The language contained therein is vicious and should be stricken completely. To allow this language to stand as it is would harm thousands of innocent people who could be considered, I believe, guilty by association because of this wording. Labor union members would be penalized for what their officers did or did not do. I call upon the House, at the proper time, to delete these words so that the rights of innocent Government employees can be protected and to do away with any possibility that innocent people may suffer through any declaration or implication of guilt by association as this language says.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate greatly the contribution that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] who is now addressing the committee has made by his very pertinent remarks. I also appreciate greatly the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that when we reach this part of the bill, there will be a unanimous-consent request that this language be stricken. I think that if this language is stricken such action will be a very fine contribution to good legislation and in keeping with the true ideals of Americanism. I want to express my appreciation to both gentlemen.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure to have the privilege of serving temporarily with the subcommittee in connection with the marking up of a portion of the bill under consideration today. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], painstakingly considered all items of the bill, as did other members of the committee. I know that the chairman did his utmost to give fair and equitable consideration to all matters before the committee. For that reason, I reluctantly take exception to the language commencing on the bottom of page 8 of the report accompanying the bill. It is as follows:

> The acquisition of the properties of a privately owned power company serving a power-consuming area by a public-utility district through a strange method of condemnation proceedings—as has already been consummated in one instance in a Northwestern State—is undemocratic in its application and should not be condoned unless such proceeding is approved the American way which is by a majority vote of the qualified voters in the respective area. Such procedure has the earmarks of a Soviet power policy and will not be countenanced by this committee and we are entirely certain that the Congress and the American people will insist that such a policy does not get a foothold in America against any private business regardless of how small or how large.

While the report does not refer specifically to the State of Washington, I assume that it has reference to my State for the reason that we do have a law providing for the acquisition of private power facilities through condemnation proceedings by public-utility districts. I am sure that if the committee had the complete background with reference to this law, this language would not have appeared in the report.

Many years ago the people of the State of Washington enacted what has generally been referred to as the Bone public power law. This law was ratified in 1930 in the form of an initiative by a vote of all the people of the State of Washington. The law authorizes the formation of public utility districts by a vote of the people in the respective districts of the State. It also provides for the election of three public utility commissioners. It is true that these commissioners, under the law, have authority to institute condemnation proceedings of private power facilities. It is also true that there has been considerable controversy in our State on this question. However, the people of the State voted on this very question raised by the members of the committee in the report in a statewide election in 1940 and again in 1946. It arose in connection with an initiative which provided that, before any condemnation proceedings could be instituted by any public utility district, a vote would have to be taken by the people in that district. The people of our State rejected this initiative. It has become the accepted policy of the State of Washington in these matters.

I have given the House the benefit of this information because I would like to make it clear that our people have voted on this question, not once, but three times on a statewide basis and, in addition, the people in every district where a utility district functions have had the opportunity of voting on this question.

I cannot help but feel therefore that the committee is in error when it refers to this method as being undemocratic. As a matter of fact, various governmental bodies in our State, and in other States of the Union, have historically had the right, through their respective elective officials and in some cases appointed officials, to institute condemnation proceedings without a vote of the people. I refer specifically to the right of cities to condemn and take over and operate water systems without a vote of the people; the similar right enjoyed by cities, counties, and States and the Federal Government to condemn property for highway purposes. As a matter of fact, offhand, I am unable to recall any situation where a vote of the people is required as a condition precedent to the institution of condemnation proceedings. The Congress of the United States has delegated to the executive branch of the Government the right to institute condemnation proceedings for a multitude of governmental purposes.

I am sure the House will understand that the people of my State are firm believers in the democratic process. A majority of our people having spoken on this issue on several occasions by a direct vote of the people themselves, I feel that we have dealt with this matter in a most just and democratic way.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. This issue has been a very prominent part of our own State politics for a number of years. Is it not true that all counties in the State of Washington, with the exception of one, rejected the initiative that would have compelled a vote on every action of a public-utility district?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is correct. I know the gentleman was very active in connection with the enactment of the original law, known as the Bone public-power law, back in 1930. I am sure he agrees with the statement I have made. I have made this statement for purposes of explanation because I know the Committee would like to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, inaction on the part of this House is alone responsible for hampering the industrial and economic growth of the cities of this Nation. I mean inaction with respect to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Recently a factual study of housing in Allegheny County, Pa., was undertaken by the Allegheny conference on community development. It declared that "communities fighting to preserve or to expand their economic bases can hardly afford to neglect the housing factor any longer." The conference is considering the extent to which the city of Pittsburgh's competitive strength is being hampered by existing housing conditions, and as an important factor in its future development.

It was stated that "Pittsburgh has its full share of the Nation's housing shortage," and, therefore, the conference backed necessary local and State action to improve and expand the housing supply. A Pennsylvania State law now permits insurance companies to invest in housing; a newly organized Pittsburgh Redevelopment Authority is ready to assemble land for redevelopers who want to build homes in Pittsburgh's older sections. The Pittsburgh Housing Authority—working with a city grant—is planning 7,000 low-rent units for construction when governmental assistance is available. City building-permit procedures have been streamlined, a modern building code has been adopted, and a city-wide rezoning plan prepared. The Allegheny County Planning Commission has been given new powers to regulate suburban subdivisions so that prospective home owners may be protected.

Mr. Chairman, all of this has been done by local action. But Pittsburgh and Allegheny County cannot go ahead full steam until it has needed Federal aid. In a report on studies of housing need, the conference says:

> The conclusions point to the necessity of State and Federal aid for slum clearance, low-rent housing, and urban redevelopment.

Some of the Members of the House may be wondering who are these Pittsburgh people who are demanding Federal aid to slum clearance and low-rent housing. Let me tell you. The chairman of the conference is the director of the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research. The vice chairmen are the president of the Pittsburgh Trust Co. and the president of Kaufmann's Department Store. The president of the United States Steel Corp. is on the executive committee. The rest of the names of officers, executive committee, and sponsoring committee are equally important in Pittsburgh's business and civic affairs. Here is what they say:

> Few Pittsburghers will deny the need for both public and private action to provide housing for every income group. The region isn't quarreling over theories. It is out to get housing for every income level.

All this comes from practical business men whose dedication to the principles of the free enterprise system cannot be questioned. Let us keep that in mind.

The Banking and Currency Committee must immediately report the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill if action is to be possible before the end of this session. Like the good people of Pittsburgh, Members of this body should stop quarreling over theories, and get some action. There must be decent housing for families of every income level.

Members of the House from western Pennsylvania desire an opportunity to vote on the question of adequate housing legislation. I do not like to charge that the majority leadership is determined that, rather than permit an open vote on the public housing title of the bill, they will scuttle it in committee, or filibuster it to death. Somehow we folk from Pittsburgh believe in equal treatment to all. In housing, that includes a reasonable public-housing program such as that proposed in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It is not right that a few Members can prevent the membership of this body from expressing itself on this all-important matter. It is time for a show-down. I hope Members will hurry to the Speaker's desk and sign Discharge Petition No. 6.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I have 5 minutes remaining. I yield these 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minority for this additional allotment of time, and while we are on the subject to say that they have been very gracious and I appreciate the cooperation they have given the committee at all times. I especially appreciate their cooperation in connection with the special assignment of my portion of this bill, that of dealing with appropriations for the Indian Service. They have been most cooperative indeed.

In the first place, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is a bureau that is something over 100 years old. It has been dealing with the people who first inhabited this country. The problem has been difficult and yet we think sometimes that the Bureau has failed in some of the most laudable purposes it has announced, so far as the accomplishment of the purposes is concerned.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I am very happy to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I once served on the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, and I followed their affairs for a great many years before that. Has the gentleman made any study at all of the Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934 and what it has done to the Indians? And is the present committee going to make it possible for the Indian eventually to become a citizen of this country?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. It is very much to be hoped that the bill will encourage rather than retard progress in that direction.

Mrs. BOLTON. And that the Bureau will do something for the Indian instead of erecting a lot of buildings?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. And our report indicates that that is the attitude of the committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. I was so happy to know that the gentleman was chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for her kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that in connection with appropriations this year for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, I would be very happy if you would read the report applicable to Indian Affairs and their appropriations, beginning at page 10 of the committee report, and then turning over to some of the items.

We have appropriated this year a total of $41,274,210 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and its activities. This is an increase of $1,467,680 above the 1948 appropriation. It is $9,850,810 less than the Bureau of the Budget recommended to our committee. Salaries and expenses have been sharply reduced. You will recall that some 2 years ago there was created at the instance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs what we call the district offices, comparable to regional office. The word "regional" had become a little odious, perhaps, to Congress. The bureau hit upon the words or terminology to be applied as that of "district offices" instead of "regional offices." Accordingly, five of those district offices were set up, one in Minneapolis, Minn., one in Billings, Mont., one in Portland, Oreg., one in Phoenix, Ariz., and the fifth in Oklahoma City, Okla.

The committee has seen those district offices functioning and in operation for almost 2 years. The committee also heard the testimony of witnesses all over the western part of the United States. We conducted a number of formal and a

number of informal hearings. We conducted a rather semiformal hearing at Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota last fall, one at the Klamath, Oreg., one at Window Rock, Ariz., in the heart of the Navajo country. Then we conducted some four hearings in Oklahoma, at Muskogee, Stillwell, Pawnee, and Anadarko, and we conducted hearings here covering some 2 or 3 weeks. We invited people from everywhere and they were almost unanimously in favor of abolishing the district offices. So the committee has done so by failing to appropriate any funds whatever for that item, thus saving $650,000.

May I suggest to you that our worthy colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], who is unable to be here, appeared before the committee and testified very forcibly on this subject. He is perhaps the only Indian Member of the House of Representatives, being a Choctaw Indian, and he knows the Indian problems well. I invite you very cordially to read his testimony given before our committee as found in the printed hearings.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman makes us all feel it is not just the money and the appropriations with which he has concerned himself and that he knows that the word without the spirit is void.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I thank the gentlewoman.

May I suggest that the money we saved by not appropriating for the district offices to the extent of $399,000, almost $400,000, was appropriated for the agency offices; that is, for the service level, where the Bureau officials come in direct contact with the Indians and the people who have business transactions with them.

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

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. The distinguished gentleman who is now speaking knows that it is also my desire that these district offices be abolished inasmuch as we have discussed the matter, and I want to compliment the gentleman and the committee for having taken this forward step. In my opinion it certainly will be beneficial to the Indian Service and it will be beneficial to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

May I say in this connection that one of the district directors, a gentleman who is director of the district office at Billings, Mont., addressed a letter to the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs under date of January 2, 1948, which you will find at page 637 and the following four, five, or six pages of the hearings, in which he confirms the action of the committee and suggests if the district offices cannot do better the district offices should be abolished.

Now, we provide in our report that more policy-determining, more supervision be exercised in Washington, and that the services be transferred, delegated, and decentralized to the service level We found Indians all over the country who advocated this program, and almost none who were in favor of the continuation of the district offices. They said it was only a detour. They said it was only a delay post, so we feel that we are highly justified in this connection. And, I want to say that the Representatives in Congress, my colleagues here who represent Indian peoples, almost unanimously have asked that this be done. I want to say to you that the most that was being done in these district offices was that which was not worth while to anybody, least of all to the Indians themselves.

Now, then, let us hurriedly pass to another aspect of the bill, the Navajos. The Navajos and the Hopi Indians are considered as one for all practical purposes here; the Navajos having the larger reservation and the Hopis the smaller. They are included in the same general area, and the consideration of one will be applicable to the consideration of the other. We took every item that is applicable to the Navajos and Hopis and lifted it out of the Indian appropriation items here and itemized it, as you will find in connection with the Navajo and Hopi Service, on page 16 of the report, to which I invite your attention. You will see that we have recommended for your consideration $4,656,515 for the Navajos. We have subdivided that so that it will not all go to administration. We have tried to earmark this, just as you will see on the next page of the report; in fact, pages 17 and 18 show a breakdown into detailed items of the pattern this year that we hope we may be able to follow in the future; earmarking the funds for every branch of the Indian Service. We have done that for the State of Oklahoma and we want to do it for all the Indians next year.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, regretting that I have not had an opportunity to read the hearings and the report, may I ask the gentleman what proportion goes for education?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. May I answer in this way? On page 18 of the report you will find "Education of Indians." The bill includes $9,574,709 for the education of Indians. This is $350,000 more than the 1948 appropriation bill provided.

Mrs. BOLTON. And how much for the Navajos?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. For the Navajos $1,924,865, much more than they ever had before.

Mrs. BOLTON. Of course, the improvement of the Indian rests upon his education.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is where it should begin.

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

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I yield to my good friend from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the subcommittee has done a splendid job on this particular bill. I would like to have made definite, however, the meaning of the sentence on page 18 of the report which reads, "It is the recommendation of the committee that the Indian boarding schools at Eufaula, Okla., and Pierre, S. Dak., be operated during the next fiscal year." That means, I assume, in addition to the other such schools that are being at present operated; does it not?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Absolutely; and I will be very happy to explain to the gentleman that that was included because when we asked the Bureau of Indian Affairs which, if any, of these schools might be eliminated, they said those two first, and we included those and all others that are now in operation and provided ample funds for their operation, even more than they had during fiscal 1948.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman stated that this bill provides some three-hundred-and-some-odd thousand dollars more than this year?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Three hundred and fifty thonsand dollars more for education of the Indians.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Than was afforded in the present fiscal year?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right. For conservation of health we provided $646,815 more than was provided in 1948 fiscal.

I could go on at considerable length, for we have found many things that should be corrected. I hope you will read the report. You will find there that in these hearings we have found diversion of funds, employment of people who were paid out of education funds and out of health funds, in the administration work. We have gone to the bottom of a number of these things, insisting that the interests of the Indians be better taken care of.

I am happy to report that as far as I know the attitude of the committee on both sides was very generous in the consideration of these problems. I am sure that on both sides we agree that the Bureau had a miserable set of records. They were not able to help us as expeditiously as we felt they should have been. We found that many improvements can be made all up and down the line, and it shall be our purpose to insist upon these improvements and watch the expenditures in detail more than we have in the past.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. 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. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The Federal Government has been presented with an opportunity to acquire the first summer White House as a free gift from its present owner, Elliston P. Morris.

The house at 5442 Main Street in Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., was built in 1772–73 by David Deshler.

After the Battle of Germantown, October 4, 1777, the house was occupied by the British commander, Sir William Howe. The house was later bought by Col. Isaac Franks, and when the yellow fever of 1793 drove all the officers of government from Philadelphia, it was rented to President Washington and became the summer White House. Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, was quartered at Fair Hill 2½ miles

from Philadelphia; Gen. Henry Knox, Secretary of War, found refuge at Falls of Schuylkill; Edmund Randolph, Attorney General, boarded at Nathan Spencer's, a mile away; and Thomas Jefferson carried on the office of Secretary of State, with one assistant, two blocks below the President's home at 5275 Main Street.

During 1793 President Washington occupied the house from November 17 to the end of the month. On November 18 an important Cabinet meeting was held in the parlor of the Morris House, when the question of neutrality between France and Great Britain was warmly debated. Again on November 21 the Cabinet met. Practically every day throughout Washington's occupancy of the house a Cabinet meeting was held.

In 1794, from July 30 to the middle of September, Washington having enjoyed the hospitality of Germantown rented the Morris House for 6 weeks. On this occasion Mrs. Washington and her two grandchildren, Eleanor Park Custis and George Washington Park Custis, accompanied the President. Custis was sent to the nearby Germantown Academy. The family attended the Reformed Church across the Market Square on which the Morris House faces. Several times a week Washington rode into Philadelphia on public business.

Full details of Washington's occupancy of the Morris House will be found in Washington in Germantown, by Charles F. Jenkins, Philadelphia, 1905. The Morris House and grounds surrounding it have been kept in perfect order all these years, and what is more important have not been changed since the days when it was the Presidential home.

Upon the death of the owner, Marriott C. Morris, on March 2, 1948, his bequest of the Morris House to the United States Government failed and title passed to his son, Elliston P. Morris, who, desiring to carry out his father's intention, has offered this house to the Government. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, on April 30 passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Board that this house is of national significance because of its historical and architectural character and its situation on the battlefield of Germantown, but in view of the heavy burden of maintenance facing the National Park Service at the present time, the Board does not recommend Federal ownership of the property.

As indicated, the recommendation of the Board not to accept title to the property is based on the fact that the National Park Service has not been able to obtain sufficient funds to maintain properly the many areas in its custody.

Therefore, to enable the National Park Service properly to maintain this valuable and extremely historic house, appraised at $100,000, which is in virtually the same condition as when occupied by General Washington, I have asked the committee to accept an amendment to this bill and to increase the appropriation on page 73 by $15,000 in order to provide funds for maintenance of these premises. Unless this is done, this valuable home, a part of our American heritage, will be lost to us.

I sincerely hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, namely.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I intended to make a statement when I had 5 minutes in general debate, but was unable to, because of the limitation of time, and I want to make that statement now. Let me compliment this committee and its chairman on the generosity they have displayed with reference to the Central Valley water project. I notice they have allowed $40,000,000 for the project. This looks as if they are aiming to get the project done at an early time to get the water to the land so we can begin getting the income that will pay for this project.

Merely because I differ with the members of the subcommittee on some minor details, I do not want them to get to thinking that I am too critical. Some of the things on which I differ with them have been in my mind for many, many years. They are mere details, although important ones, in the development of this great project in California. Also, I think it is fair to say that some of the things that I sponsor here and am in favor of have been confirmed by the voters of California and by five Governors of our State, four of whom have been Republican Governors.

In the original plan, and this committee is merely carrying out the original plan developed by Mr. Hyatt, our California State engineer, and his associates, it was provided that there should be an integrated system of power. This plan was approved by the voters of California. The plan was approved by Governors Young, Rolph, and all succeeding Governors. So, I am only speaking the voice of the people I represent here. But I want the committee to know that we are grateful for the help they are giving us. We hope this great project, which is the most unique of its kind in the entire world, can soon be completed and the United States can begin getting back some of the money we have invested in it. Originally it was estimated to cost $170,000,000. The cost has now gone up to almost $400,000,000, which means that higher water rates and perhaps higher power rates will be required to pay out on this project ultimately.

Just one thought in closing: I think the committee should be ever mindful of the fact that the compensable parts of this great project are paid by the people who live under it. In other words, the United States is the banker to finance this great project. No private-enterprise system could ever have embarked on this scheme. It was too fantastic, it was too uncertain, too long and uncertain in its repayment. So the United States came along and is, you might say, loaning us the money. For all the compensable features of it, the hydroelectric development and the irrigation features, we are paying back every dollar. For the electrical features we add 3 percent to the payment. So, ultimately the people of California and especially the water users and the electrical consumers will pay back the money for this great project. I think that the byproduct of electricity will go a long way to help lighten that burden in that it will give cheap rates for electricity to consumers of all kinds in the homes, factories, pumping houses, and so forth. Therefore, I want the RECORD to show my appreciation and deep gratitude for the statesmanship and generosity which impelled the committee this year to give the largest amount that has ever been given in any fiscal year, namely $40,000,000 to the Central Valley project of California.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the gentleman refers to $400,000,000 as the overall cost, what phases of the Central Valley project is he referring to?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am referring to all of it. That is a very rough estimate. We have spent about $200,000,000 to date, as I recollect, for the entire system from stem to stern the cost will be another $200,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe the gentleman will find in the testimony that on the basis of today's price levels costs may run between $3,000,000,000 and four and a half billion dollars from the northern tip to the southern tip of the project until it is completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the gentleman is confused about that. I am talking about the Central Valley project authorized by law. You are talking about the development of the entire interior valley.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am only talking about the one that we have before us today. I think the gentleman is right as to the ultimate development of the whole interior valley water resources. At least I have seen estimates of $2,600,000,000 for the development of all the water sites in the interior valley. But here today we are only talking about the Central Valley project approved by statute. But I thank the gentleman for his observation. It shows what tremendous possibilities for development lie ahead in the great Central Valley of California.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a week ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that we have

a loophole in the European Recovery Act of approximately one-half billion dollars which very few Members of the House are aware of. I refer to the International wheat agreement now pending before the Senate and which has been sent to that Body for ratification where a two-thirds vote is necessary. That particular wheat agreement binds us as a Nation to deliver 185,000,000 bushels of wheat a year to the seaboard at a maximum price of $2 per bushel. It could possibly be a price of $1.50 per bushel if the powers that be known as the International Wheat Council decide that shall be the price. That particular agreement also, if entered into, may possibly have the result in the year 1952—speaking of that crop year—of forcing the farmers in America to accept $1.10 per bushel for their wheat on the seaboard provided we have a surplus which we are offering to the 33 importing nations under the act.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Can the gentleman tell the committee who controls this International Wheat Council? We do not control it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is a very interesting question. I brought that out a week ago in my remarks in the RECORD. Great Britain, with all due respect to her as a great nation, through her connections with Canada and Australia, controls approximately eleven hundred out of the two thousand votes that are represented in that particular wheat council. The United States is empowered only to exercise control over 370 votes. Personally, I do not want to give over to any foreign nation or any combination of foreign nations the right to say how much wheat in southwestern Minnesota and the Dakotas shall be worth during the next 5 years. Under this agreement that price could be disastrously low.

I think it is absolutely foolish that we should require that the United States should deliver 185,000,000 bushels of wheat at the seashore for consumption under ERP at $2 a bushel, when the taxpayers of America will have to pay a subsidy of 75 cents a bushel, at the very least, in order to deliver that wheat to the ocean ports. Consequently, the Commodity Credit Corporation will come to the Appropriations Committee and ask us to make good possibly $155,000,000, the subsidy that will be directly paid by the taxpayers of America, for the 1-year's shipments. If you multiply that $155,000,000 by 3 or 4, you can see where there is a loophole of at least half a billion dollars that the Members of Congress did not know they were authorizing to be expended under ERP during the 4½ years of that act. Now, that is not chicken feed, in the financial sense. If the Members of the House are interested, they should contact immediately their Senators and ask them to use every precaution before they agree to the ratification of this particular treaty. Remember, one foreign government controls 1,100 of these votes in comparison to 370 for the United States of America. All I ask is that you take a little time and discuss this matter with your Senators. They are very busy gentlemen and they may be too busy to really study and know the provisions of this particular international wheat agreement. The more you study it the more you will wonder why we in the United States should be suckers enough to agree to it.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I may say that the Canadian wheat farmer has been operating under a similar program for a number of years. It is a little different. It operates only between member countries in the commonwealth and the mother country, England, but the Canadian wheat farmers are up in arms, and our farmers will be in the same position if this unfair agreement is foisted upon them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think this particular proposed agreement is full of very dangerous implications. It may set a price of 85 cents a bushel on wheat in the Dakotas in 1951 and 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to this request to speak out of order, but I shall be obliged to object to any further requests of that nature.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I am gravely concerned with the situation whereby we grant millions of dollars in loans and subsidies to Great Britain, send her vast sums under the European recovery program, and find that she is financing the Arab aggression against the Republic of Israel. It is high time that our Government take a strong stand against Britain's intervention in Israel.

We all know that Transjordan King Abdullah's Arab Legion is financed, equipped, trained, and supplied by the British. Britain pays Abdullah 2,000,000 pounds annually for the maintenance of the Arab Legion. Brig. Gen. Glubb Pasha is the commander in chief of the Arab Legion and an officer of the British Army, loaned to the Legion by the British War Office. Everyone knows that the British control the Transjordan Arab Legion, lock, stock, and barrel. The British have been playing the most perfidious game since both before and after the withdrawal from Palestine. Great Britain is aiding and abetting Arab aggression and is greatly responsible for the slaughter now taking place in the Holy Land.

Great Britain is now actually and actively engaged in supporting the war against the Republic of Israel, recognized by the United States; and so we have a situation where a military unit of an Arab puppet state of Britain, bound by treaty to undertake no campaign without the approval of his Brittanic Majesty, proceeds to occupy the international city of Jerusalem and the hallowed cradle of Christianity—Bethlehem—a legion equipped with British weapons, paid for with British money, and led by British officers.

The United Nations, with the active concurrence of Great Britain, has called for a truce in the Holy City.

The Transjordan Legion, equipped with British weapons, paid for with British money, led by British officers, is occupying and shelling that Holy City.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said, there are depths below which no man, no government, no country may descend without bringing upon itself the scorn of honest men and women everywhere. I am amazed to see that these depths have been reached by the government of a people allied with us. I do not know what Britain has gained by her activities in Jerusalem. I do know what Britain has lost—the respect of the people of America and of the world.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment for the purpose of speaking on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes to speak in order.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to compliment the committee for giving due consideration to the Central Valley project of California. I have had a chance to travel over that territory and study the proposition for the last several months, and to me it is one of the greatest undertakings in all history because such a vast percentage of our people are now moving to the Pacific Coast, and the Pacific Coast from the northern tip of the Pacific Northwest to San Diego, Calif., is becoming a great defense plant from the standpoint of military operations and industrial production. That population will certainly depend upon the natural rainfall and snow fall which occurs in the mountain ranges, and that water will have to be captured and carried down through the Central Valley to the Pacific Coast cities and the food producing farms in the valley and all along that western seaboard.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, based on the studies of engineers and experts, and surveys which have cost millions of dollars up to date, there is no other source of water supply for that great population there at the present time, and the rapid increase of population which is taking place.

In considering the over-all Central Valley project, I think before it is completed and provided costs continue on today's price level, that the people of the United States will have been called upon to provide a minimum of $4,000,000,000 in the way of public funds to do that complete job. That, of course, includes the over-all concept, and it goes far beyond the projects which have been authorized up to date.

The whole operation presents a very interesting study from the standpoint of industry and finance, the charging of

rates for electric power and for the use of water to irrigate lands. It involves a great basic question with respect to the ownership of the land to which the water is supplied from dams and reservoirs and canals built with Federal public funds. We have out in that country what is known as the 160-acre limitation which states to a man who owns five or ten thousand acres of land in the Central Valley of California that he may not, when these projects are completed, be able to obtain irrigation water for that big section of land because of the 160-acre limitation.

To give you an idea how interesting these things become sometimes in the political field, California papers carried editorials and news column comments to the effect that the gentleman now addressing you is one of the leading Communists of the United States, simply because he takes the position that if Government funds are to be supplied for this project, perhaps the 160-acre limitation should remain in the law as it is at the present time, instead of repealing that 160-acre limitation and arranging matters so that great aggregations of land may be used specifically by a single land owner and sharecropped or operated on the basis of farm tenants or of farm hired hands. That illustration shows just how far this thing goes.

Mr. Chairman, in some of those areas you have municipal ownership of power-developing plants. This over-all concept may call for Federal funds to go into those particular communities and build distribution lines and have the Federal Government under the Central Valley project take over the presently municipally owned power plants. That gets into the question of local taxation, it gets into the question of power rates as related to those now being charged by public utilities owned by local people as compared with power rates that may be charged by the over-all Federal rate-making machinery. So this will be no simple project to be worked out. You will have cases where the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. have great distribution systems, including distribution lines, and the Government lines that will be built may compete with them.

I simply wanted to make these few remarks on this general subject at this time.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, you are giving consideration to appropriations for one of the big agencies of our Government, the Department of Interior. Total appropriation amounting to more than $375,000,000. The agency employs 47,675 people. They are located in various parts of the country.

It is with respect to one of the matters of employment to which I want to direct your particular attention at this time. You are familiar with my effort to try to get Government agencies to adhere to laws, rules, and regulations in employment practices. At all times I have insisted that rights of career employees and veterans be respected.

I take the floor at this time to call attention to a kind of "pressure" that is going on in some of the departments. The Department of the Interior is no exception as I will illustrate by the following experience.

Several weeks ago I directed a letter to one of the field offices for a career employee who had filed an application for a position, but who did not seem to be able to secure a reply to his inquiry, although he had been informed the agency was recruiting employees for which he believed he was qualified. A copy of my letter with names deleted follows:

GENTLEMEN: Mr. ———, of this city, whom I have known for a number of years, says he has placed an application with your offices for employment.

This letter is simply to inquire what, in your opinion, are the chances for his securing employment in your offices within the rather near future.

Mr. ——— is a career-service employee with permanent status. I think he is qualified for the appointment he seeks. In any event, if you will give him some idea as to the chances of his employment, I will appreciate it.

Sincerely,

ED H. REES.

P. S.—The reason for writing this letter is because Mr. ——— seems to be at sea and does not have much idea as to whether he stands a chance for such employment.

Reclamation Service, Department of Interior. (Location deleted.)

It will be observed clearly no request was made for the employment for this person. Later I received a reply. The letter is from the office of the department manager. I quote from the letter:

Under ordinary circumstances, such an employee would make a valuable addition to our staff, and Mr. ———'s employment would have—in all probability—been effected some time ago. However, the congressional appropriation for the Department of Interior for the fiscal year of 1948, you will recall, placed a limitation on the amount of money that can be used for personnel administration. As a result it has been administratively determined that this project must perform its personnel work with a reduced force of general clerks. Although the conditions are not the best, we are complying with the order.

The letter, as I have stated, is from the department manager. It is unsigned except that his name is typwritten and ready for signature. In fact the letter was dictated by an associate. Attached is the associate's note, written on a piece of scratch paper. Here is what the personal note to the manager says:

MR. ———: Mr. ——— and I thought it best for you to see the attached file. If you agree please sign the letter and return the file to this office.

The "dig" for the lack of funds is, I believe, quite consistent with the present Bureau efforts to try to get Congress to forget the limitation they placed upon money used for personnel administration.

Frankly I could use a man—placement officer—to help with our present recruiting problems. This is, of course, impossible when there is no money given the project for personnel administration.

——— ———.

Mr. Chairman, so the committee will understand, what happened was the associate, by mistake, mailed the whole correspondence to me instead of sending it to his district manager.

This is another case where one of our higher-salaried employees takes time out to do what he says take a "dig" at Congress because Congress does not perform in line with his ideas.

Mr. Chairman, I agree this is one of few cases. Even so, there are too many of them. You will observe this man says the "dig," as he calls it, is consistent with Bureau efforts. If such policy is followed in any agency, large or small, it seems to me we should at least know about it.

Until, and unless, we can have a higher degree of cooperation between the higher officials in the Departments and agencies of our Government, and the Congress, we are going to have difficulty in bringing about improvement in efficiency and economy in Government employment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time first of all to commend my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] for his very able discussion of this bill insofar as it pertains to appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But, for the sake of the RECORD I would like, if I may, to propound a few inquiries to the gentleman. The committee has undertaken, as I understand, to make ample provision for Indian education, and has specifically earmarked, so far as Oklahoma boarding schools, day schools, missionary schools and tuition payments, appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Together with the hospitals and the local superintendents and agencies throughout, which is more than they had for 1948 fiscal.

Mr. ALBERT. All of our Oklahoma schools and hospitals are provided for?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. All of them are to continue in operation with additional funds for their operations over 1948 fiscal.

Mr. ALBERT. Likewise the tuition payments?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right, with increased amounts.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

I also understand that in the abolition of district offices all important functions of those offices such as education, health, Indian roads, and soil conservation will be taken care of by transfer to the agency offices.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. To the agency level insofar as present law will permit. It is hoped that where present law will not permit, the legislative committee will take cognizance of that. I may say very frankly that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Public Lands, the legislative committee, has approved the attitude of this committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Was it also the intention of the committee that ample provision be made in the bill for field service personnel, that is, personnel who work at the service level, coming directly in contact with the Indian and his problems, such as field clerks, field agents, secretaries, probate attorneys, appraisers,

and such officers as are necessary expeditiously and efficiently to carry out the work of the Indian Bureau?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is what the committee attempts to emphasize. The appropriation of $399,000 over 1948 fiscal and the abolition of the district offices has that in mind.

Mr. ALBERT. It was not, then, the intention of the committee in transferring functions to the agency offices to allow the agencies to do away with necessary subordinate offices?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Quite to the contrary; wherever they are needed.

Mr. ALBERT. Where offices of the service level are needed, then, it is intended that they be maintained and, if necessary, that personnel and other functions be increased?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Wherever it is necessary, and reactivated services wherever it is necessary, to perform the service with those who have business transactions with the Indians.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] and the other members of the committee for the hard work they have put in on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] and I may be permitted to revise and extend our remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that work on another appropriation bill has prevented me from hearing any considerable part of the general debate or of the debate under the 5-minute rule on this bill. I do, however, want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the long, hard, arduous, and intelligent work the members of this subcommittee have given to the Interior Department appropriation bill this year. Certainly in the time I have been a Member of the House, there has never been as much time devoted to preparation of the Interior appropriation bill as has been here evidenced by the voluminous hearings on the details of the bill. I also wish to express my appreciation for the intelligent approach the committee has made to various matters with which it deals. While in some respects the bill is not as I personally would have written it, I think considering the magnitude of the task the committee has done an excellent job.

In particular I wish to commend the subcommittee and its chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for taking cognizance of specific individual projects and providing for them. A good illustration is found in two items which may draw little attention in the general press, the $500,000 for the renovation of the Statue of Liberty and the $152,350 for the flood-lighting and other improvements at Mount Rushmore National Memorial in the Black Hills in South Dakota.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Iowa and members of his subcommittee visited both of these monuments which symbolize the great traditions of the Nation and were struck by the need for improvements to make them more available and more appreciated by the people of the country and the world.

STATUE OF LIBERTY

The Statue of Liberty, they found in a sad state of dirt and disrespect. One of the most famous symbols of freedom in all the world, cherished by every American who has sailed to a foreign soil and dreamed of as he looked forward to his return, the Statue of Liberty had been taken for granted and was neglected. It needed cleaning, removal of refuse, and the establishment of facilities so that visitors could actually visit it.

And, as I understand it, the committee wants folks to be able to come close to the monument and feel its spirit and carry its inspiration to every corner of the Nation and every quarter of the globe. So they are providing funds to make it possible to get from the mainland to the island and to accommodate the visitors who pass through the great metropolis of New York.

RUSHMORE NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Rushmore, the great American memorial, known as the Shrine of Democracy, is newer among the Nation's great monuments, but in the minds of many, is the greatest, in its conception and in its permanence, of all our memorials. Out in the heart of the continent, the sculptor, Borglum, whose head of Lincoln is regarded by many as the finest study in the great galaxy of works in the rotunda of the Nation's Capitol, brought to life the heads of the four great Presidents—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt—on a mountain of imperishable granite.

Last summer, when this subcommittee was making its tour of western parks and other activities administered by the Department of the Interior, they came to Mount Rushmore after darkness had fallen. They had expected to be able to see the memorial after dark, even as visitors in Washington can see the brooding figure of Lincoln in the subdued light that is found at the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington, after hours. But the mountain was dark and they were disappointed. They then resolved not to let that happen to the hundreds and thousands of others who might arrive at twilight or after.

For Rushmore has become one of the most visited of all national memorials. Last season, nearly half a million people visited the mountain coming from every State in the Union and from many of the countries of the world.

The possibility of lighting Rushmore Memorial has been proposed in other years; but the requirements of completing the sculpturing of the great faces themselves and the demands of World War II for money have made it impossible to get consideration for a lighting project heretofore. Even this year the Bureau of the Budget did not submit an estimate. Cost figures were worked out by the National Park Service at Mr. JENSEN'S request, however, and I asked the subcommittee to add the necessary funds to the bill. The committee gave a sympathetic hearing as shown in the printed hearings and granted the request as set forth on pages 37–38 of the committee's report.

Not only did the subcommittee provide $56,900 for the installation of floodlights, but they provided the $95,450 I also urged for a water and sewer system to provide proper facilities for the care of the hundreds of thousands of visitors who are now visiting this shrine. And to this total of $152,350 for improvements, they added $4,938 for seasonal personnel for the operation of the lighting system and the service of the night visitors.

The lighting of Mount Rushmore, Mr. Chairman, promises to usher in an entirely new era in the growing appreciation of this great memorial.

The Rapid City Junior Chamber of Commerce recently conceived the idea that it would help in the advancement of the idea if they would arrange for a temporary lighting. And so, within the past month, through the cooperation of the air force base near Rapid City, they arranged for the floodlighting of the mountain for 1 week, using some gigantic antiaircraft searchlights.

Reports which I have been receiving during the past week say that the effect was spectacular beyond all expectations. Just yesterday, I had a letter from John Boland, the president of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, saying: "I am not capable of expressing my deep feeling." And a letter from another party states that Boland said that in all his 20 years of association with the memorial he had never experienced an equal thrill.

Mr. Chairman, Rushmore is something which every American should now see. The heads of the four great Presidents are impressive under any circumstance. To see them out of the night in a setting of mountain peaks and shadows will be an unforgettable experience for the millions to whom the committee and this Congress, by this action, will have made it possible.

While I thus record my appreciation as the Representative of the district in which this great shrine of the Nation is located, I do so in the belief that the committee and the Congress have made a great contribution to an appreciation of the very ideals of the Nation. Nothing, Mr. Chairman, is more important in these days of clashing ideologies, than a true love for the men and the principles which made the United States both the beacon and the bulwark of liberty for all the world.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to inquire of my friend and colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, a distinguished member of this subcommittee, as to the limitations on the Southwestern Power Administration transmission system contained on page 5 of the bill.

It is my understanding that the Southwestern Power Administration is this year completing a very expensive transmission line that links up to federally constructed and paid for dams and public power projects in the Southwest, the Norfork Dam in Arkansas and the Denison Dam in Oklahoma and Texas. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. The gentleman is correct. There is under contract now and under construction a high tension line which connects the Denison and Norfork Dams. The budget contained recommended appropriations for switching stations and substations necessary to step down the power and convert it to usable form to make it available for the REA's and the municipal cooperatives that might want to purchase it.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the smaller users such as the REA's and small villages that may have their own distribution systems, and other public users cannot now tap this line that was built at the expense of many millions of dollars by the Federal Government to carry electricity that is generated by dams that cost many more millions of dollars. But the benefit and use of electricity cannot be put into the hands of these REA's and small cooperatives, because of the denial under this bill of any funds to construct outlets such as substations.

Mr. GORE. Except that an REA might build a $1,000,000 substation. It then might be available to them. In actual fact, of course, this unfortunate action represents the bus-bar philosophy which means that even though the people's money has been invested in the generating facilites in huge sums, the benefits are denied to them unless a toll is paid to the private power industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does this not go just a little bit further in addition to meeting the utility desires—that instead of being a bus-bar deal, we build a transmission line, and then the utility companies are virtually the only ones who can take this electricity from the Government-built transmission line. No funds are provided in this bill or any other bill that I know to take this electricity in usable form down from the overhead high-tension line to the small users such as the REA's.

Mr. GORE. I stand corrected. I see from the gentleman's understanding of the situation that I should be interrogating him, rather than he interrogating me.

Mr. MONRONEY. It does mean that it will be even more profitable for private utilities because they will not even have to use their transmission lines, but can take this from a Government transmission line, and thus they will be the indispensable middle man through which the small REA's and small villages having municipal systems can tap this line to get this Government-generated electricity.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman is correct. Even though the people of the United States have made the bulk of the investment, private power industry will control it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the gentleman give me any reason why the subcommittee, as well as the full committee, of the House would bring in a bill which would deny funds that have been requested by the Bureau of the Budget, which funds have been advocated by the small REA's over the entire State of Oklahoma and which are necessary if the lines are to be properly completed? Can the gentleman state why this money was completely left out of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Insofar as I am concerned, the action is without justification or reason. But the gentleman recognizes, of course, that there is a fundamental difference of opinion between certain Members of Congress, as well as between certain citizens of the country, as to the electric power policy. This question goes to that fundamental. This is the bus bar policy. With that policy, I am thoroughly in disagreement.

Mr. MONRONEY. The failure to furnish any funds to make that electricity from that high-tension line completed this year usable by farmers and small village cooperatives means we will have to wait another year, and perhaps two or three, until this wasteful policy is finally changed by the majority party in control of the Congress, is that correct?

Mr. GORE. All construction items are eliminated from the bill for the Southwestern Power Administration. All monies for customer facilities, and all monies for any facilities that would make the power available to rural cooperatives and municipal cooperative systems are stricken out.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for the information.

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

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the intelligent exchange of information between the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is so in accord with my thinking on this appropriation bill that I cannot refrain from making further comment. As I read the record, the total budget request for Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines and substations was $20,805,690. This amount was cut $12,910,649 by the committee, leaving an authorization of $7,895,041. The decrease was more than 60 percent. These figures are totals for the 17 reclamation States.

This, in my opinion, is conclusive proof of the bus-bar philosophy which dominates the thinking of the Republican members of this committee.

As this bill comes to the floor for debate it stands revealed as an attempt to turn over to private utilities the public's investment in, among other things, power facilities which were intended to develop, in the interests of all the people, the natural resources inherent in the great rivers of our Nation.

What does this bill do to the power marketing agencies set up by congressional acts designed to safeguard the public's interests and to make the benefits of the Government's power developments available to all the people? For an answer we need only turn to some revealing passages in the committee's report and in the bill itself.

For the Southwestern Power Administration the committee says that it has, and I quote, "eliminated all funds for the construction program, it being of the opinion that such necessary additional facilities as may be required should be provided by organizations in the power business in that area where the power is to be distributed." Fine sounding words, but what do they actually mean? They mean simply that the Government must sell at the bus bar to the private utilities at their own price and for their own exploitation, all the power generated at numerous dams in the Southwest. They mean that municipalities and REA co-ops that desire to purchase this power shall be entirely frozen out and must go begging to the private power companies for an opportunity to stay in the power distribution field. The law under which the Southwestern Power Administration operates, the Flood Control Act of 1944, however, says that the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit and dispose of this power in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and that law further says that preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

So here we find the committee saying that so far as it is concerned this law shall be disregarded and that the private power companies, the same companies that fought that law tooth and nail, the same companies that have denied farmers the benefits of electrification, that have reduced rates only under the compulsion of previously aroused Congresses and strong public opinion, these private power companies shall become the exclusive beneficiaries of the public's investment. But this is but the first instance of this type of chicanery in the committee's report and in the bill.

In the section dealing with the Bonneville Power Administration we find that the committee baldly asserts that the people of the State of Washington acting under laws enacted by the Legislature of the State of Washington to take advantage of the preference privileges in the Bonneville Power Act which are even stronger than the public-preference privileges contained in the act controlling the policies of the Southwestern Power Administration are pursuing a Soviet power policy which will not be countenanced by the committee. In line with that remarkable statement from the committee, that gratuitous insult to the people of the Pacific Northwest, the committee denies funds for the construction of certain substation and transmission lines, because private power companies have expressed a willingness to construct them. The committee also admonishes the Bonneville Power Administration to so conduct its contract operations in the future as to insure that the private power companies will be taken care of ahead of the public agencies to which preference in the purchase of Bonneville power is guaranteed by law in the Bonneville Power Act. So here again we find the committee acting in utter disregard of the law of the land as enacted by the Congress in an effort to assure, regardless of that law, that the private power companies may become the principal beneficiaries of the vast investments

heretofore made and from which all of the people originally were supposed to benefit.

And, to render the rape of the public interest complete, the committee does to the Bureau of Reclamation power operations the same thing that it does to the Bonneville Power Administration and the Southwestern Power Administration. Again disregarding the preference provisions for the sale of power under the reclamation law, we find the committee saying that it is unsound and against the principles of our form of government to appropriate Government funds for the construction of transmission lines, switchyards, substations, and incidental facilities where private capital is prepared to provide them. Certainly the Congress, since 1906, the first date it wrote a preference provision for the purchase of Government power by municipalities and other public bodies into the law, has not considered that in so doing it was committing an un-American act. It is this committee which is acting against the principles of our form of government when, in total disregard of the laws of Congress, it attempts to place the private power companies between the public and the public's own developments.

Let us see what else besides these expressions the committee has written into the bill to make sure that its whims are carried out. First we find that there is a general deletion and reduction of items for transmission lines and substations without which no public body can hope to take advantage of the preference provisions which the reclamation law has supposedly guaranteed them since 1906. Not content with that, we find that in the case of a specific project, the Canyon Ferry Dam on the Missouri River, the committee has gone so far as to write into the bill a provision which says that no funds may be expended for construction of the power plant, power facilities, or transmission facilities of that project except for the excavation and construction of the foundation for a powerhouse. In other words, the committee would have this Congress direct the expenditure of millions of dollars to construct a dam at which it invites the Montana Power Co. to install a power plant, pay the Government whatever it chooses since the Government will have no bargaining power, turn around and sell this power to the public and reap all the benefits of the public's investment.

On the Central Valley project, we find the committee is again up to its old trick of denying all funds for transmission lines other than those necessary to provide power to the project pumping plants except such transmission lines as are desirable to deliver all the power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. So, here again we have the committee deciding that contrary to the express provisions of the reclamation law Shasta and Keswick Dams of the Central Valley project shall be built as mere adjuncts to the private power monopoly of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Not only that but in the case of the Central Valley project, in the face of the greatest power shortage ever experienced in the State of California, the committee states that it has denied the funds to operate the two new generators that will be in service in the next fiscal year. Here indeed is a shocking example of the committee's disregard of the rights of the public. I have not yet referred to the project which most directly concerns the people whom I represent in the Congress, the Colorado-Big Thompson project. In that case, the committee by reducing the funds for power facilities delays their completion and delays the integration of the now disconnected power-generating facilities on that project in the face of the greatest need for power that this country has ever seen.

It is my sincere hope that as this appropriation bill is considered in the other body, there will be a full and complete restoration of all reasonable requests for funds in order to effectuate the original intent of Congress. In the consideration of this type of legislation the public interest and the general welfare of the people as a whole is of paramount importance.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee, which I have previously discussed with him. I realize fully that the committee, as a group, as is true of all other subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, has cooperated wholeheartedly in an effort to conserve, as far as we can conserve wisely, the use of fuel oil. It may be suggested that this is not an appropriate time to bring up this matter, but I have done so in connection with each appropriation bill and intend to do so in connection with those remaining. Our national situation is brought home forcibly to me this afternoon, since I have just left a hearing before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where we are trying to discover what the policy is as to the exportation of increased amounts of steel and oil-country goods at this time.

I have discussed the matter with the chairman and the clerk of the committee, and I believe I am correct in understanding that there are no funds provided in this bill for new installations of oil-heating units, or for the conversion from coal to oil-heating units. Yet I think it is proper for me to ask, so that it may be in the legislative record of this bill, if it is the intention of the committee that no such funds shall be used unless it can be clearly shown that it is a wise policy, because of the fact that there is a large amount of oil available in nearby areas. I make that simple qualification, because I understand through a misprint in a previous bill unfortunately the words were used, "when there was an oil shortage," when actually and in fact the words I used in presenting the amendment were "where there is no oil shortage." I intend to cooperate to correct that before the session ends.

Going back to this particular bill, may I put it this way: Am I right in understanding that there is not only no request for money in this bill for the purpose of converting any coal-heating units to oil, or the installation of any new oil-heating units, but also, obviously it is not the intention of the committee that any such use should be made of any funds provided in this bill?

Mr. JENSEN. In answer to that question, the most I can say is that of course there is a great deal of money in this bill for the construction of hydroelectric dams, but there is no money in this bill for the construction of steam plants. It would be difficult for me to visualize that there would be any money in this bill for anything that would require oil or gas or coal for heating purposes or for generating purposes. There might be some little insignificant furnace some place in the Interior Department where that might be true, but to my knowledge, I know of none.

Mr. HESELTON. In general, it carries out the purpose of the Executive order of the President which is still in effect, that all Government agencies shall do their best to conserve fuel oil until we get out of this difficult period.

Mr. JENSEN. That is true.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the chairman for making this explanation. Such a statement will certainly be a clear expression of the committee's intention and a definite standard to be used by those charged with the responsibility of spending these funds.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that amendments may be offered at any point in the bill following the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it the gentleman's request that the bill be considered as read and that amendments may be offered, for instance, to the last line of the bill and then somewhere else in the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 46, after line 18, insert the following: "Water conservation and utilization projects, Buford-Trenton project, North Dakota, not to exceed $126,000 of the unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made under 'water conservation and utilization projects' shall be available for completion of construction of the Buford-Trenton project, North Dakota."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment and of this appropriation is to complete the Buford-Trenton irrigation project in North Dakota. During the hearings there was considerable testimony given to the committee on both sides of this question. The committee took the position that until the gentlemen from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE and Mr. ROBERTSON] and other officers concerned could agree on this project, the committee would take no action.

I am glad to report that both Mr. LEMKE and Mr. ROBERTSON have come to

a full agreement and they desire the amendment to be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 73, line 10, strike out the sum "$1,541,464" and insert "$1,556,464."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 76, line 8, after the word "for", insert a comma and the following: "of which not exceeding $50,000 shall be available for use in connection with the installation of two elevators at Carlsbad Caverns National Park, New Mexico."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to start the construction of two elevators in the wonderful caverns at Carlsbad, N. Mex. They are very bardly needed. The item was not presented to the committee in time to act intelligently on the justification. We now have the full information and we feel the item is fully justified and proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 96, line 10, after the word "violence", strike out the remainder of line 10 and all of the lines down to and including the word "act" in line 16.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the language which we seek to strike out in this amendment has been included in some other appropriation bills. Since we have given this matter our fullest consideration we feel that the language which we seek to strike out goes further than can be properly justified. We feel that the balance of the language, however, that pertains to the same matter is in the interest of good government. Those who have taken an active interest in this matter, both those for it and opposed to it, feel it is proper that the language be stricken out of this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having charge of the Interior Department appropriation bill for the sound, sober judgment it has used in striking out this so-called Red rider or Keefe rider that has been carried in three previous appropriation bills. An attempt was made on the floor of the House to eliminate this rider on three occasions before and each time it was turned down.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy this afternoon to note that after cool, calm consideration of the far-reaching effects this Red rider may have on all employees of the Government, it has been finally decided to strike this from the pending appropriation bill. I sincerely hope we will not have this type of legislation in any more appropriation bills which may be brought before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it is very obvious from this bill that the subcommittee in charge of it has done an excellent job. By the amounts that have been allowed for western development and progress, it is not to be taken to mean any insinuation against any Western State. However, my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. Jackson], has already called to the Committee's attention some criticism of a certain Northwestern State which is charged with following the Soviet pattern in certain matters involving the condemnation of existing electric power facilities. It is rather obvious that the State of Washington was the State referred to in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the people of the State of Washington some recounting of this Washington public-utility law is now in order. Of the total hydroelectric power in the world, some 750,000,000 horsepower, about 20 percent exists on the North American Continent, or approximately 150,000,000 horsepower. Approximately one-third of that is in the Pacific Northwest and in the Columbia River, which drains some six or eight watersheds, including the Rockies, both in the United States and Canada, the Cabinets, the Cascades, the Siskiyous, the Blue Mountains, and other mountain ranges in that tremendous drainage area of the West.

Mr. Chairman, the Columbia River has a tremendous flow. There is more water flowing down that river than any other river in North America, with the exception of the lower Mississippi, which flows through flat territory and is not a potential hydroelectric power producer. The only rivers in the world that compare with the Columbia are those which rise on the high plateaus of equatorial Africa and flow down through the Belgian and French Congo and the French Cameroons, but they are so located that their hydroelectric potentialities are nil.

Now, this is a lot of hydroelectric water power. There are about 20,000,000 horsepower of immediately practical hydroelectric energy in the Columbia River. Whoever controls it controls the future of the Pacific Northwest. There are many people of various political ideologies who fully recognize that fact. In this day, when we have to take the floor as my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, did, and make sure that no oil is used in heating buildings; when we know that our gas, as an industrial fuel, is not located so as to serve the whole United States; when we step up succeeding fiscal year appropriation bills because of the rising cost of coal, which can and has risen one, two, and three times during a fiscal year, thus adding to our burdens as taxpayers, it is time that we take an interest in this hydroelectric energy. The people that I represent have long ago taken an interest in the hydroelectric power in the Columbia River. As early as 1930 they made up their minds on this thing: That the Columbia River potential was so great that it would be built and developed in the Nation's interest, mind you, either by great syndicates of bankers or by the Federal Government, the latter being a fact, because it is an interstate stream, draining western Montana, almost the total of Idaho, the eastern part of Washington, and a good share of the State of Oregon. The choice was made almost by indirection during the thirties that the Federal Government, as an aid-work project, should build the Grand Coulee-Columbia Basin project, a multiple-purpose project. It was done as a way to put men to work and to consume materials produced elsewhere in the United States. It began generating power 3 months before Pearl Harbor.

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

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. It was a happy day for the United States, believe me, when Grand Coulee was built. It contributed a whole lot to the building of our airplanes. Aluminum, which goes into airplanes, into the airframes and into the wings, has been called nothing more than frozen kilowatts. This Congress voted only recently to implement our air force to a 70-group air force. It is going to take aluminum, but how are you going to get the fuel with oil running out, gas improperly located, and coal rising in cost? Thus did we build Bonneville and we built Grand Coulee. They are both valuable to the Nation. More such projects should be built on the Columbia River. But what of the people who live there? Are they not also entitled to the use of this power? So, the farmers who live in the isolated areas of my district and the farmers throughout the State decided that some program should be put into effect, written into the statute, that would give the people who are residents of the area some voice, comparable to the domination of either the Federal Government or the great syndicates of bankers. So, the Public Utility District Act came into being in 1930. Naturally, since it involves "power" it has been controversial ever since. Yet it follows largely the same pattern that we follow in the building of public roads. It is a district not greatly different from a reclamation district or a school district. It can be formed only by vote of the people and it can be dissolved by vote of the people. Its directors are elected at regular elections. It is an attempt to get the people of a certain area together to work for a common cause. That issue has been voted on three or four times since it came into being. As late as 1946, in the last congressional election, at which time we felt that we had purged our State of some of our radicals, in that type of an election where the conservative element overrode the others, this

issue was before the voters of the State of Washington in the form of initiative 166. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent in an attempt to put 166 over, which would have forced the commissioners of these districts to call for a special vote every time they took a step that meant the development of a project.

It is the same thing as though you were forced to go back to your district next week, when we shall have the draft law before us, and have a special election on that one issue, with your candidacy hanging in the balance on the outcome of that vote. That, as a matter of fact, is a European, not American system.

We have other districts that do have condemnation powers and do not have to have separate votes to take such action. States can. Cities can. Counties can. Districts of all sorts can. Bear in mind that we have very active elections in these public utility district elections out there. The whole issue of what is to be done during the term of a man that is standing for office is reviewed by the people, and they vote accordingly. But this 166 would have compelled them to hold an election every time they turned around. I expected it to carry, and thought our public utility districts would have to hold such elections. The tenor of the people was anti-Communist. It was against tax spending. I ran on an economy platform, and I know how they felt. I expected it to carry. What happened? Those folks, after 16 years of experience with this old system of common- or group-action enterprise or political functioning as you have in school districts and in reclamation districts in States, counties, cities, and so forth, voted overwhelmingly to down 166, which would have compelled those elections. It carried in only 1 of 39 counties. These people had faith in their program.

I wanted you to have this background because it is deeply imbedded in the life, in the hopes, and I think in the integrity of the people of the State of Washington. It is not a Soviet pattern. It is distinctly American and democratic. The appellation does them an injustice.

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

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Washington, in whom I have the highest confidence and respect, I certainly cannot agree that a program or a policy or a law in any State in this Union which permits the condemnation of private property and the taking over of that private property without a vote of the people who are directly interested and have the greatest interest in the property which is condemned, and in the property which will be built in its place, is proper. I still contend, as the committee stated in the report, that it is a step toward a Soviet power policy. I think we in this Congress have a responsibility and a duty and we have taken an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States. Certainly that Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken over without due process of law.

In my opinion, even though I am not an attorney, certainly no law that is a good law is anything other than common sense. If a law of that kind has been enacted, as it has been in a certain State of this Union and possibly others, I contend that the law will eventually fall of its own weight, or this country will fall into the hands of socialism or communism or dictatorship or some other thing that is obnoxious to our way of life.

Let me give you an idea what we have to protect. We must protect not only private business, not only the private utilities, but everyone down to the peanut vendor down on the corner. We must protect the fellow who carries on an honest business, either with his own hard-earned dollars, or with the hard-earned dollars of other people, as is the case where stockholders have their money invested in the large utilities.

Let me read to you the kind of revenue that comes into the Treasury of the United States each year. In the year 1947, for instance, which is the last year on which we have a full report, the private utility companies paid in local, State, and Federal taxes the sum of $657,000,000. That was in 1 year, the year 1947. We all know how the Government needs this money. We know that federally operated projects pay no taxes into the Treasury of the Federal Government. So if we are to continue to collect enough money, then certainly we must guard private industry, and every other private enterprise from the peanut vendor down to the biggest corporations in the United States that are doing business on good, sound, honest business principles, and see to it that they are not driven out of business and driven off the tax rolls of the country by a paternal government, which, of course, is strong if it wants to be strong.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGAN: On page 76, line 6, after the word "including", strike out the sum "$3,210,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,245,000."

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will add $35,000 only to the amount to be used for repair and construction of trails and highways in the Park Service. Here in the Big Bend section of Texas, there is what is known as the Big Bend National Park. The State of Texas has set aside as its contribution to this park 1,000,000 acres of land in the bend of the Rio Grande, about 200 miles east of El Paso. The park has been designated by the Congress as a national park, and improvements have been started there. But a matter has developed recently on which the park authorities had no previous information, and they have been prevented from completing their roadways into the park. Last year, without roads, more than 28,000 visitors from the United States visited the Big Bend National Park, which abounds with certain types of rugged mountainous scenery, canyons, large trees, points of interest, and what not.

Recently the State Highway Commission of Texas completed a road to the entrance of the park at a cost of over $500,000. The Park Board was to continue the road on down through the park to the many scenic spots, where the cabins are located, and into the canyon part of the country.

I would like to show you on this blackboard what we ran up against. The State highway built a road up to the north line of the park. The Park Board then came down here, and they find they have to go out of the delineated line of the park to get through a pass between two mountain ranges, known as Persimmon Gap. This means that we would have to buy a right-of-way there for the highway.

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

Mr. REGAN. I yield.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman speaks about this new piece of road down in Texas right across from Marfa. Is that right?

Mr. REGAN. That is right.

Mr. GILLIE. I am glad you brought that up, because when my committee was down there holding hearings in El Paso, they came to us and told us about this particular road being badly needed. Several citizens from Marfa spoke to our committee about that and said it was badly needed so that they could use that as a park entrance.

Mr. REGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILLIE. I am glad to endorse what you are saying.

Mr. REGAN. The people of that part of the country are very much concerned about providing this facility to get this park open so that the thousands of people throughout the United States may take in this park in connection with the chain of national parks they are visiting. The Park Board estimated that 200,000 people will visit the park each year. The gasoline tax alone will more than pay for this right of way in a 30-day period.

The State Highway Commission completed this portion at a cost of half a million dollars down to the entrance of the park. Then, it is the Park Board's responsibility from then on. They find that they have to go out of the confines of the land in the park. The amount required is only $35,000. It increases this $3,210,000 appropriation for trails by $35,000. I hope the committee will see fit to adopt this very important amendment, because it is the only way in which we can get this road constructed in a 2-year period of time.

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

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

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, it does not give me a bit of pleasure to oppose this amendment, but I am compelled to do so because of the fact that there are so many requests for items of this nature, on both sides of the aisle, that it is difficult to put in an item of this kind which is not in the emergency category, and for which we have had no budget request. I think this item would have been approved if it had come to the committee in the regular manner. But if we were to approve this item we would have to approve many others of like nature.

So I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. REGAN. The gentleman is correct. There are many others as meritorious, undoubtedly. But this is an emergency matter, in a sense, because it was just recently discovered that we would have to go within the line of the park to build that road. They cannot build the road until that land is acquired.

Mr. JENSEN. It is often said, the longest way around is the shortest way home. I do not know whether this is in that category or not, but I do not think it will hurt those people to travel a little farther around for a year or so.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] has already explained to you many of the features of this, I think you should be told that the Park Board—the National Park Service—has considered building a road over this range of mountains here illustrated on this blackboard, and they find it will cost over $100,000 to build the road over this range down into the park. This road goes down to the Rio Grande River, where are many of the features which visitors wish to see. Even with a poor trail which runs from the entrance by a devious route down into the main part of the park, 28,000 people went there last year. It is estimated that over 200,000 will visit the park next year. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is self-demonstrating that we could recover in gasoline taxes alone enough to buy this right-of-way land through this gap in the range of mountains which lies just outside the park boundary.

The gentleman argues that no budget request was made for this item. None was made because it was not known until recently that the land which had been delineated by the Secretary of the Interior to bound the park did not extend beyond this gap. We and the Park Service people thought that the boundary extended over to take in the gap so we would not have to build a road over the mountain.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is making an excellent statement and I wish to commend him and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] for the good work which they have done on the Big Bend project.

It is true that technically there was no budget estimate, but there was a budget estimate for the acquisition of land in parks in the sum of $200,000. Big Bend was not listed as one of the parks where the money could be spent but the Interior Department advised the committee that the $200,000 would be adequate for all purposes, including Big Bend, and that a little change in language was necessary but no funds in addition to the budget would be required. In other words, the Big Bend project could have been taken care of without exceeding the budget. Unfortunately, the committee struck out the entire $200,000 and so there is presently nothing in the bill which would take care of the needs in the Big Bend.

I wish to join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS], and others, in doing what can be done to include this little item for our park in Texas. The gasoline taxes alone payable to the Federal Government by reason of travel in and to the park would soon reimburse the Government for this small outlay.

Another thing that should be borne in mind is that the State of Texas has contributed more than a million acres to this park and certainly this request would represent a minor contribution on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman. Let me point out that the State of Texas has spent half a million dollars on a road leading down to the park, but the park is practically closed because there is no road within the park, which the Federal Government should provide.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. It should be pointed out that the $35,000 involved is a maximum amount, and that it is entirely possible, if not probable, that the project may be opened for a great deal less money than that, that the right-of-way might be purchased for less. Am I right about that?

Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BURLESON. And that the money that is spent here as far as the emergency nature of it is concerned is a fraction of the investment already made by both the State and the Federal governments.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly right.

If the gentleman from Iowa has no more serious objection to it than he has already stated, I am quite sure that he will not object too much if the Committee passes this amendment. I urge its adoption.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REGAN) there were—yeas 40, nays 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 51, line 25, add the following: *"Provided further,* That no moratorium or stop order that may be issued by the President can abrogate in whole or in part the use of any appropriation for reclamation or flood-control projects as provided for in this legislation."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to bring into focus some things that had happened to past appropriation bills for public works and reclamation.

It will be remembered that in the Seventy-ninth Congress we had an appropriation bill before this body for consideration concerning reclamation, flood control, and public works projects. It will be recalled that the Bureau of the Budget and the President had recommended to the Congress all of these appropriations for this type of work. They were for Federal construction works. Upon the recommendation by the President and the Bureau of the Budget the Congress adopted legislation covering this matter. It will also be remembered that these appropriations were sent to the President for veto or for his approval.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman's amendment is a good one. I know that last year or the year before the President issued a stop order against the construction of a lot of reclamation projects. As far as the committee on this side of the aisle is concerned, we are prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I appreciate the chairman accepting the amendment. I would like to finish my statement.

The appropriations were sent to the President for veto or for approval. He approved them all. In fact, he signed the appropriation bill in the presence of a score of Members who sponsored the bill. Pictures were taken, pens were given out, and the President said it was a great step forward.

The Congress adjourned on August 2, 1946. A letter came up to this Chamber on August 3, 10 days after he had signed the bill, at which time he said it was a great step forward, advising Congress that he had put a stop order on this great forward march on reclamation, public works, and flood control. He made inoperative in whole or in part the legislation, first approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the President, then by the Congress.

It is my opinion that the President at that time overstepped his constitutional authority in abrogating an appropriation bill duly considered by the Congress. If he can do that in reference to public works, he can do it for veterans' hospitals, social security, the national defense, and other things.

It is for that reason I offer this amendment to the pending appropriation bill, always remembering and keeping in mind what happened during the Seventy-ninth Congress. Before the echoes had died out in this Hall after adjournment, the letter was sent here checking this great march of progress. I do not want to see that happen again. In my opinion it was a rather unusual power that the President took unto himself at that time in abrogating an act of this Congress. This amendment will make impossible the illegal assumption of authority by the President. If this is not done Congress will no longer control the purse strings as provided by the Constitution and popular self-government will end.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], clarify for me and for the committee the last

proviso on page 7 of the bill, reading as follows:

Provided further, That interest heretofore or hereafter collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power in Grand Coulee Dam shall be covered into the reclamation fund and shall not be allocated.

I wonder if the gentleman would briefly explain that provision.

Mr. JENSEN. I will be glad to. To make it perfectly clear to the Members of the House who are not familiar with what happened a few years ago, we had a Solicitor of the Department of the Interior who ruled that it was not necessary for the Reclamation Bureau to cover into the Treasury the interest component, which, according to basic law, should be paid on all revenue-producing facilities, such as hydro-electric-power plants. When that matter came to the attention of our committee a couple of years ago, we took the position that that money should be either covered into the Treasury of the United States or covered into the reclamation fund. So in the 1948 appropriation bill we provided that the interest component for the Bonneville Power Administration should be covered into the reclamation fund and should not be allocated. In the bill this year we have expanded that and have now covered all reclamation projects throughout the Nation that are federally owned and put in the same language relating to every project as it now relates to Bonneville Power Administration in the 1948 bill. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman understands that we have worked out a feasibility test on the Columbia Basin-Grand Coulee project, and we have worked out a pay-out program so that the Federal Government will be sure to get its return and that the Columbia Basin will be developed as a solvent reclamation unit. I wonder if this proviso, as it now reads, will have any deleterious effect upon the feasibility of the Columbia Basin and our ability to amortize?

Mr. JENSEN. Only to this degree, that 3 percent interest must be put into a suspense account or reserve interest account and cannot be used in computing your pay-out schedule. In other words, it must not be considered in your pay-out and your rate making will thereby be affected, naturally. We will, however, under this system, be complying with the law of the land which provides that interest should be paid on these revenue-producing projects. Now, then, the committee is not asking that this interest component be covered into the Treasury of the United States. We are asking that it be covered into the reclamation fund, from which we appropriate back to reclamation. It does not make a lot of difference, only to this degree, that naturally the more money we can collect, whether it be in payments on projects or whether it be interest, and the more money the Federal Government will get into its Treasury, the more liberal we can be in appropriating money for the development of the West.

Mr. HORAN. In appropriating in this bill for fiscal 1949, did the subcommittee consider the inclusion of the phrase "during fiscal 1949" in the drawing up of this proviso?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not quite understand the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. You are here appropriating for 1 year, 1949.

Mr. JENSEN. That is all we can appropriate for.

Mr. HORAN. That is right, and I wondered if the subcommittee had considered at all the inclusion of the phrase "during fiscal 1949."

Mr. JENSEN. Well, naturally, we consider that it will be the law. At least, it is to provide the proper procedure until a permanent law can be passed which will take care of this whole matter, like the Rockwell bill, for instance.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: On page 95, strike out the comma at the end of line 10 and lines 11, 12, 13, and 14 through "1947"; and in line 24, after "violence", strike out the remainder of page 95 and on page 96, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, down to and including "1947" in line 3.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment simply as a clarifying amendment in view of the action the committee took a short time ago on page 96, when an amendment struck out certain language. This amendment simply strikes out the same language appearing in other parts of this section.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee because I think it is very important to correct what I think he has done unintentionally. If we pass this bill with its present language, as a result of the committee amendment which was offered at page 96 we will be legislating a new statute today making it a criminal offense for railroad employees, those employed on railroads that have now been taken over by the Government, to go out on strike. I am sure that is not the intention of the committee and not the intention of the Members of this House.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Before I yield, let me explain how this comes about, for I am sure the gentleman will agree with me.

When the committee struck out the language on page 96, you struck out the following language:

or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act.

When you struck that out, you struck out also the following language, and this is the key to the situation:

and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act.

By having taken out that language, you make this penalty provision applicable to anyone employed by the Government, not just to the Government employee who receives salary or wages under this appropriation. When you do that, what do you do with respect to railroad workers? The Government has taken the railroads. The railroad workers now work for the Government. If any of them should go out on strike, you are now legislating a criminal statute against them. I know the committee never intended to do that. I do not believe it was your intention to do that. The committee offered an amendment to eliminate a provision which should never have been in the bill. I urged its elimination this morning. However, in eliminating that provision, you eliminated also the language I have just mentioned and as a result of such elimination you make it possible now to indict any railroad employee who goes out on strike. The committee amendment, therefore, which was adopted on page 96, should have removed the language on line 10, page 96, after the word "violence" down to and including the figure "1947" on line 14 and no further. If you had left the language, following the figure "1947", then you would not have legislated a criminal statute against strikes on the part of employees not affected by this appropriation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to any gentleman of the committee for any observations they would like to make on that point.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman believe that people should strike against the Government?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is not the issue here. Let us not start dragging herrings here which do not belong in this discussion. Let us be sensible about this business. Do you want to enact that kind of criminal statute which is being enacted by error and which is not intended?

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I cannot yield to the gentleman from Tennessee at this time, because he is not making any relevant contribution, but I want the gentleman in charge of this bill to deal with this subject at this time. I think he never intended to accomplish what is being accomplished.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, after we strike out what we have stricken out by the amendment, the balance of the language will be identical with that which was in the bill last year. Certainly no one wants strikes against the Government of the United States.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The language will not be identical. Strikes against the Government is not the issue. First of all, as you have amended this bill, the language is no longer identical with that in the bill you passed last year.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, of course, we know how the gentleman feels about such matters.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is not a question of my being satisfied. I think I am doing the committee a service because you are going to come back here after this goes to the other body and you are going to admit that you made an error. I am trying to correct that error now.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to shut the gentleman off, and I shall not shut him off, but certainly we have some things to do here. We have many things to do and we have just this day to do this work of getting this bill through the House. I shall not object to the request of the gentleman, but I hope that no one else asks for additional time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not trying to delay the passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman. I earnestly believe that a serious error is being made. I submit again that when the amendment was offered by the committee it was offered in good faith. It was offered to correct a situation which we pointed out this morning to be bad. But in doing that the amendment struck out additional language which limits criminal penalties to only those employees who are paid out of this appropriation. By taking out the language "the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act," you are now enacting a criminal statute which can be made applicable to the railroad workers today. That was never the intention of this committee. If we just want to insist on doing something that is wrong just because we want to appear right, if we just want to be stubborn about it, all right, but, at any rate, I want this House to know just what it is doing. I think that after consultation between the committee members on both sides and with the legal adviser of this committee you will agree with me that this language has to be restored; otherwise we are enacting a criminal statute which will affect the railroad employees today and the miners tomorrow. It will affect any employee of any industry which has been taken over by the Government. This fits the railroad workers today. You cannot get away from that. This does not go into the question of whether they have the right to strike or not. That right I will sustain in debate with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] on another occasion, but it does not belong in this debate. Unless the gentleman from Tennessee is ready to stand up and say that this is what the committee intended to do, then he should urge the correction of the error. I do not think the gentleman is ready to say that he wants to accomplish what the committee amendment does—that is, to establish a felony penalty against railroad workers who go out on strike.

This comes about as the result of an honest error and I am calling on the committee to correct it. At any rate, I think the membership of the House should know what it has done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has again expired.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REDDEN: Page 76, line 6, insert after the semicolon the following: "Of which $150,000 shall be available only for completing the grading and resurfacing of Heintooga Ridge Road, Great Smoky Mountains National Park."

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not increase the appropriation set forth in the section to which it refers. It simply earmarks the $150,000 for the completion of the Heintooga Ridge Road section of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

I might say for the benefit of the Members that, as you know, there has been quite a bit of earmarking done in this bill, and I think very properly so. This item was approved by the Park Service of the Interior Department and was put in the budget. It was also approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It was considered by the Subcommittee on Appropriations which wrote this bill. The facts concerning the importance of this project were submitted to the committees and considered by them.

This morning I went to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and suggested to him that because of the importance of this project there ought to be an earmarking of a certain portion of the fund. He told me that he would agree to the earmarking of this $150,000, in accordance with the amendment just read. I then went to the Democratic side, where I found the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in charge, and I submitted it to him. He likewise agreed, and said he would be happy to see it go through.

So, with that information and consent of the gentlemen on both sides, I hope the committee will see fit to approve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REDDEN) there were—ayes 28, noes 52.

The CHAIRMAN. The noes seem to have it; the noes have it; the amendment is not agreed to.

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

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman on his feet at the time the announcement was made?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I stepped out of the Chamber for just a minute, and did not understand what the amendment was.

I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. I think it is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will again put the question, so there will be no mistake.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I know we do not want to make a mistake. I believe the Committee is acting honestly and sincerely enough, but actually making a mistake—unintentionally, of course. I believe that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in his interpretaion of what we have done is eminently correct. Let me call this to the attention of the Chairman of the Committee and the membership. I do not always agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], but I not only have a high regard for his honor, his integrity and ability, but I have a real affection for him. I think he is a truly great American citizen. I know that he always wants to be fair, and I think that is true of the rest of us; not only do we want to be fair but we want to be efficient in our work.

On page 95 we struck out certain words dealing with this question that has been discussed here for some little time, relative to persons who might be members of a labor organization, the officers of which have not complied with subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

We struck out certain words as they appeared in two separate places on page 95.

On page 96 we intended to strike out those same words and none others but we struck out more than those words, and in striking out more than those words we included the striking out of these words in line 14 "and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act."

As I understand it, if I am not myself in error, those words should have been left in the bill so as to make them applicable to the classes that we did leave in the bill. We struck from the bill this class:

Any person who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

We struck that class out, but we left the other classes in, and we intended this language: "and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act," to apply to those we left in; but we took it out also.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that he is 100-percent correct in his contention and I trust that the committee will take some action immediately with regard to the situation and restore the language which the gentleman has pointed out was deleted through error.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. We have now calmly considered this whole matter and have come to the conclusion that what this committee wants to do, and what we are quite sure the Members of this body are willing to do, is to leave the language in this particular bill, and I am speaking of this particular Interior Department appropriation bill, exactly as it appeared in the 1948 Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. MORRIS. That has not been done though.

Mr. JENSEN. I am prepared to offer an amendment at this time which will take care of the situation.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for seeing the error and correcting it.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 96, line 10, after the word "violence" and the comma, insert the following: "and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriations contained in this act."

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman should not have gotten so hot when I suggested that a while ago.

Mr. JENSEN. I have seen the gentleman get a lot hotter than I got.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is all right too.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman shows very bad taste in making that statement after I have looked the matter over and have agreed now that I was wrong.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let us call off the hot war and the cold war.

Mr. JENSEN. O. K.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, line 21, insert after the colon the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 10 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, not a limitation. The mere use of the words *"Provided further"* does not mean it makes everything in order. This is legislation relating to the requirements that must be met by one person or certain employees of the Bureau of Reclamation before they may hold office or be appointed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CURTIS). The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is a limitation, that it refers to a part of this appropriation; therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk a letter signed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAY 14, 1948.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee for Interior Department Appropriations of the Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is in response to your request as chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in charge of the annual Interior appropriations bill for information with respect to the present administration of the Bureau of Reclamation of that Department.

For more than 2 months the Subcommittee on Government Publicity and Propaganda of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has conducted a careful investigation of the Bureau of Reclamation both in Washington and the field. Hearings have been under way for several days and considerable documentary information concerning the Bureau's activities have been laid before the committee. Although the hearing will extend for several more weeks, I am certain that the information already at hand from this committee's investigators, and the documented testimony of Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY of California fully justifies the Appropriations Committee in writing into the pending Interior Department bill appropriate language to correct a condition within the Bureau of Reclamation which the Congress should long ago have dealt with; that is, to restore the Bureau of Reclamation to the enviable position it long enjoyed as one of the outstanding construction agencies of the Government. Toward that end we recommend that appropriate language be included in the Interior Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1949 to accomplish the following:

(A) That on and after July 1, 1948, no money in the appropriation bill shall be used to pay the salary of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation unless he be a qualified engineer: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; (3) Regional Director of Reclamation. The language of this section should be strong enough to cover any positions which may be created as a substitute for these same responsibilities.

(B) That the Commissioner of Reclamation and Assistant Commissioners of Reclamation shall be appointed by the President.

(C) That regional directors of reclamation shall likewise be appointed by the President, and shall be selected from lists of qualified engineers submitted by the Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation.

As you doubtless know, the present Commissioner of the Bureau, Michael W. Straus, is not an engineer nor has he ever served in any administrative capacity over any irrigation, reclamation, or other construction projects. Up to the time of the appointment of Mr. Straus as Commissioner in December 1945, every Commissioner had been an engineer, most of them of eminent reputation and all of them, with a minor exception, with long and varied experience in the Reclamation Bureau or other great irrigation and reclamation projects in western America. The exception to which I refer was David William Davis who served as Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation in 1923–24, for a relatively short period.

It seems to be generally admitted that the duties entailed upon the regional director of region 2 of the Bureau of Reclamation in which lies the Central Valley of California are more difficult and complicated than those of any other region and it is a startling fact that while regional directors in the other six regions of the Bureau of Reclamation are engineers with long and varied experience in construction and reclamation, Richard S. Boke, director in region 2, is not an engineer and prior to his appearance in the Central Valley in 1945 was totally lacking in administrative, engineering, reclamation, and irrigation experience. Undeniable facts, almost wholly of a documentary nature, secured from the files of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior clearly indicate that under Commissioner Straus and Regional Director Boke the operations of district 2 have become most inefficient, wasteful, and largely given over to propaganda and publicity activities.

In support of this statement we attach to this letter a list of 10 items that have been developed in relation to Commissioner Straus' and Director Boke's activities in the Central Valley. These are wholly, or almost wholly, based upon the record of the Bureau of Reclamation and are, in my opinion, undeniable. I think a review of this admitted data will convince you that the recommendation herein contained indicates that congressional action should be taken to require the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the regional director of such Bureau to be engineers and this action should be immediately taken.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

In support of the recommendations contained in the attached letter, I would direct

your attention to the following actions by Commissioner Straus, Regional Director Boke, and others within the Bureau of Reclamation:

1. On August 31, 1945, Mr. Straus, then Assistant Secretary of the Interior, prepared for Secretary Harold L. Ickes a statement of Mr. Boke's education and experience, copy attached, which is so patently false that the impropriety of the action speaks for itself. On the face of it this statement was intended to mislead Mr. Ickes as to Boke's fitness for the job of director of region 2. Mr. Straus' ultimate purpose in this is also clear, namely, to place the vast Central Valley project in the hands of a propagandist for the Bureau's socialistic policies.

Please note the last paragraph of Mr. Straus' letter in which he says:

"Boke is distinctly not one of our regulation reliable, noncrusading Reclamation engineers and his original arrival in the Bureau of Reclamation was accomplished with considerable difficulty in one of the better jobs (present salary $6,750)."

2. Mr. Boke's entrance in the Bureau has also been documented before this committee and the documents are here attached. While closely related to the foregoing Straus letter, I feel they should be separately considered. Observe the letter from Mr. De Marcus, a personnel officer of the Reclamation Bureau, dated September 2, 1944, which finds Mr. Boke clearly unqualified for appointment as regional head of Operation and Maintenance on the Central Valley project.

3. Also attached is a photostatic copy of a statement by William E. Warne, then Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation and now Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated October 24, 1944, to Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of Reclamation, recommending Boke's appointment as head of the Operation and Maintenance Division of the Central Valley project. The same sheet carries Mr. Bashore's flat rejection of Boke for that position on the ground that he had no qualification for it and that within the Bureau there were well qualified men who could be appointed.

4. Perhaps the most serious charge now on record with our committee was the Bureau's repeated statement to the appropriation committees of the Congress that its carry-over of funds from fiscal year 1947 would be $44,000,000. Within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year the carry-over was found to be around $88,000,000 and is so reported in the President's budget for 1949, at page 445. Senator WHERRY, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the Interior Department bill, Senate Appropriations Committee, has reviewed this monstrous error of the Bureau and his statement in the matter will be found in the joint hearings before the House and Senate Appropriation Committees on December 3, 1947. Whether the Bureau had some willful purpose in misrepresenting the carry-over figure or whether this was the result of gross negligence is really immaterial. The gravity of the error is such that those responsible for it should be no longer trusted by the Congress.

5. In the Central Valley project, according to evidence in our files, there appears to have been a clear design to exhaust the funds of that project in the first 6 months of this fiscal year. Attached is a copy of a teletype by Regional Director Boke to the Assistant Regional Director R. S. Calland, which was a command to spend the project funds as rapidly as possible. The proof of that is the attached memorandum by Mr. Calland on June 17, 1947, in which he states that, "The Secretary and the Commissioner (of Reclamation) are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year, by January 1, if possible." Here clearly is defiance of the Congress and a violation of the Antideficiency Act.

6. Partly as a result of the work program outlined in the Calland memorandum, but more specifically as the result of some corrupt design, the full import of which is still under study by my committee, the Central Valley construction program was largely shut down on last November 30. The record is very confusing, but we do know that there was serious mismanagement of the Bureau's accounts and gross errors in the statement of accounts payable; but what is even more serious, there were adequate funds to keep the project going and Congress, being then in session, might reasonably have been expected to provide additional funds. The record shows, however, that Commissioner Straus took no action with the Congress, and Mr. Boke, then on vacation, took no action with the contractors, to keep the project under construction. This committee's investigation has already reported on the mismanagement of the Bureau's accounts in region 2 and the availability of funds when the project was shut down.

7. We are informed that your committee is already aware of the Bureau's practice of spending holdback money on construction contracts rather than setting up such funds as an account payable. This practice has been condemned by the Bureau of the Budget as a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act and is clearly a violation of good management practice. It is but another illustration of the arrogance which the Bureau displays toward all actions of the Congress to regulate the administration of the executive departments.

8. This committee also has documentary evidence of a lobbying campaign by Commissioner Straus in northern California during November 1947, in which he clearly importuned the people of that area to bring pressure on Congress to cancel the authorization in the 1944 Flood Control Act to the Army engineers to build Folsom Dam on the American River and transfer it to the Bureau of Reclamation. Commissioner Straus' campaign is distinctly in violation of section 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code, which prohibits a Federal official from using funds appropriated by the Congress to influence the Congress on pending legislation. Bills to effectuate the transfer of authority over Folsom Dam—H. R. 4152 and H. R. 4157—were before the Congress at the time of Mr. Straus' campaign to stir up animosity and public prejudice against the Army engineers.

9. Finally, this committee is deeply concerned with the tremendous campaign of publicity and propaganda which the Bureau has unloosed, especially in the Central Valley area. When faced with realities that skilled and conscientious administrators would have dealt with fairly and openly, Mr. Boke and his staff have consistently tried to develop differences with the farmers and irrigation districts into public issues and to enlist the cooperation of various groups in a campaign in behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation's ideology. To promote these campaigns the Bureau has created false and misleading statistics and has employed, at great expense, economists and sociologists who have been willing to produce "studies" to support the Bureau's point of view. There is direct evidence that the Central Valley project conference of California, composed of representatives of certain farm groups, veterans' organizations, labor unions, and religious bodies, was formed under the auspices of the Bureau of Reclamation as a pressure group for the Bureau and its policies. This fact is documented by statements of present Bureau employees who were responsible for the creation of the conference.

The persistence of the Bureau in pressing its propaganda campaign is illustrated by the fact that when Congress sharply reduced the funds for its information activities last year the Bureau created essentially the same jobs in other divisions and reassigned the affected employees to them. If necessary, the personnel ceiling in a division was raised to permit the reassignment. At the Sacramento regional office Robert Burns Read was thus transferred from the position of information specialist in the Information Division to economic editor in the Division of Power Utilization. Mr. Read's description of his duties and a statement of his past connections with other organizations are a part of our record and are attached hereto.

10. Propaganda activities of a particularly insidious character are noted in several instances in which the Bureau's personnel have tried to force economists and technical men to yield to the Bureau's policy line when the facts pointed in the opposite direction. One evidence of this, from among many, is the attached statement by Mr. Max Stern, regional information director in the Central Valley project, who suggested that the conclusions on a study of groundwater conditions in the Central Valley be changed because he believed the report, as drafted, supported the views of Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, rather than the Bureau's views.

The illustrations we have here given are but part of a developing picture. I shall not detail the several additional lines of investigation which this committee has under way, for the facts here presented seem abundant support for our belief that this Congress must immediately act to forestall further high-handed management, and costly blunders, in the administration of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the author of the amendment and 5 minutes to the minority of the subcommittee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] for an additional five minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, owing to the incompetency of these men in the Department, and in my own State of California on the Central Valley project it is going to cost the people of this Nation and the farmers and taxpayers of my State $100,000,000 additional when we pay for the project. These men are not qualified to spend the taxpayers' money. Evidence has been submitted time and time again before the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate bearing out that fact.

Last December 1 Commissioner Straus ordered the Central Valley project stopped practically in its tracks, every phase of it except a couple of small items. At that time he made the statement no money was available, and he made that statement to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate in a joint session. What did we find out? A few days later, after the project had been stopped and more than 1,500 people had been put out of work, and they had made the statement they did not have one dollar to continue construction work we found they had $6,000,000 available. The

Bureau of the Budget stated their accounting system was bad.

They are not engineers, they are not capable, they are not qualified. We talk about economy and want to build power projects and reclamation projects, yet we keep on the pay roll as administrators people with no engineering ability. I doubt if any one of the three or four men now running the Bureau ever constructed a chicken coop. Yet we have them on the pay roll, and the Secretary of the Interior told the committees of the House and Senate that they were engineers. At a later date, with these men on the stand, an examination of the records was made and we found that none of them were engineers, yet they were building projects that cost $400,000,000. During the many years the Bureau of Reclamation was a fine public agency it has always had qualified engineers at the head of it but now what do we find? We have just propagandists, acting at the expense of the taxpayers. As I said a while ago, it cost our people in the Central Valley $100,000,000 more of repayable expense on account of the inexperienced and untrained men who run the Bureau. That is why I have offered this amendment. It is time we put our house in order.

We are talking about economy, and instead we have waste. Laboring people were put out of employment right at Christmas time—1,600 of them. When we had $6,000,000 available, they told the Congress that there was no money available, and that is why they had to stop the project. It is a sorry thing, gentlemen, when Members of the Congress are called upon to stand up and be counted, and support the ideals of such people and keep them on the pay roll. We ought to have qualified engineers to do this job. These men have lied to Congress. They lied to the Senate, and they have lied to my people back home many, many times. I believe in all seriousness that for the sake of saving our country and doing something for our people, the citizens of America, that we should employ competent engineers to do a job that we have started for our people and expect them to pay for. We cannot have economy with waste, and we cannot have economy with incompetent people in the management of business and large projects, such as I have mentioned to you, ranging from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 or more, and where the head of the project and the department heads under him are not qualified engineers to pass on the construction being done by the contractors. Nobody here would employ a man to do a job such as is being done out there on Central Valley without qualified engineers in charge. We should have people who we can call on to make a statement, and we know that the truth is being told when they finish making their statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which, contrary to the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], does, in my opinion, reach to a principle. I do not think this need be considered on personalities at all. If we have a matter involving health, we want a doctor; if we have a matter involving setting up a set of books, we want an accountant; if we have something which requires the ability of an engineer, we want an engineer. In the construction of great projects of this country, we want men who are engineers and not men who would not know the difference between a slide rule and the Golden Rule.

I think this is a good amendment. I hope it will be adopted by the House, and reestablish, if I may use that word, the principle which has almost without exception been the policy in the Bureau of Reclamation, that engineers should do engineers' jobs.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would the gentleman specify what kind of engineer? Chemical, mechanical? There are many kinds of engineers. If I might humbly submit, the amendment is ill-considered.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I will settle for any engineer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked for this time was not to discuss the facts involved, but to call attention to how far-reaching amendments may go under the guise of a limitation in affecting organic law. My point of order was impersonally made. It in no way related to the facts involved, one way or the other, in this amendment; but I have been very much concerned for a long time, as a Member of this House, as to the unlimited extent that organic law can be affected under the guise of a limitation on an appropriation bill. I made the point of order just to accentuate that point. Sometime some Congress is going to realize the far-reaching effects that flow from this practically unlimited power to change organic law, at least for one fiscal year, on an appropriation bill under the guise of the use of a limitation. So my observations grow out of this amendment, rather than being related to the particular amendment, but addresses itself to the broader question, Should there not be a limitation upon the use of an amendment by way of a limitation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have the highest regard for my colleague and whip on the minority side, but would the gentleman, a great lawyer himself, in need of legal advice, hire a carpenter to defend him in court?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, asks a question which indicates that perhaps he has not caught the import of my remarks. I said I was not addressing myself to the facts involved in or growing out of the amendment, but that I was addressing myself to something I think of far-reaching importance and that we will have to consider some one of these days: Whether or not there should not be a restriction on the rule of limitation in regard to amendments to appropriation bills.

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

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] in his own time had read to the committee a letter addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriaions signed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], who in turn acted as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures instructed by the full committee to investigate certain activities of the governmental agencies in the field of propaganda and publicity. I happen to be a member of that subcommittee and have been constant in my attendance at the hearings.

The committee has not yet made its report and may not do so for several days. We have other witnesses to hear, including some of the highest officials of the Reclamation Service; but I can say, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, that the evidence thus far produced, almost all of it documentary in character, incontrovertible, gives one pause, to say the least. I am not indulging in extreme statements or the use of overstrong adjectives. It is not a pretty story. We joined our subcommittee in instructing the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], our chairman, to address that letter to the Committee on Appropriations. We realized perfectly well that we were perhaps making an unusual request to the Committee on Appropriations, but we did so because we thought, indeed, we were convinced that under the circumstances which we have unearthed thus far a most extraordinary situation exists. That was our conviction. That was the reason for our making this suggestion to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee on Appropriations in its wisdom evidently was reluctant to include such an amendment in this bill, but the situation is such, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that this proposal is worthy of the serious consideration of the members of this committee.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior is one of the greatest construction agencies in the United States. In addition to the Bureau there is the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army which in addition to its military duties has charge of all of the work of construction in river and harbor improvements and flood control. Those important works we trust to the Engineers. The Governor of the Panama Canal Zone is a member of the

Corps of Engineers. It is quite proper and always has been deemed proper heretofore that the Chief and the heads of divisions in the Bureau of Reclamation should be engineers. The gentleman from Tennessee spoke a moment ago about the Civil Aeronautics Board. I point out that one of its greatest chairmen, Dr. Edward Warner, is a very fine aeronautical engineer. That has been true of other members. On the Federal Communications Commission they have them, and they have them elsewhere.

I should like to point out also, with reference to the remarks of the gentleman from New York, that just as lawyers have a code of ethics which they must live up to in order to remain a member of their professional association, so do engineers have a code of ethics which they too must live up to, and that code of ethics requires integrity, truth, and honesty of purpose. I am an engineer myself, and a member of several engineering societies. I heartily commend this amendment, without personal animus for anyone, as an amendment that should be adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ.]

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, since the pending amendment has been so well discussed up to this time—and I thoroughly agree with the arguments of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—I am going to devote my time to what may be termed a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of this subcommittee, when he offered the amendment for the elevators for Carlsbad Caverns said that the matter was not presented in time for the committee to act intelligently on it. We understand what the chairman meant, but I am afraid my constituents might not understand. So I want to remind the chairman of the subcommittee that I asked to be heard by the committee long before they started hearings and although they had a very long list of witnesses more important than I they did finally grant me time near the conclusion of the hearings. They heard me fully. I presented the facts just as vigorously as I could possibly do, and I am very grateful to the committee for that opportunity and for the amendment agreed upon and adopted, even though they had first turned me down.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly do not cast any reflection on the ability of the gentleman, but he knows there are other ways of getting information than from Representatives.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I understand that.

Mr. JENSEN. It might be we got some other information that convinced the committee that this was a proper amendment and that the project should be approved.

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] if all on this side favor this amendment, why was it not offered on this side of the House?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The amendment now under consideration, or my amendment? My amendment for Carlsbad was offered by a Republican, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the chairman, after I importuned him all morning with what I thought were cogent arguments. Maybe he did a little more checking and cogitating after that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the Republican side is supporting this amendment now under consideration, I want to know why it was not offered from this side of the House?

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, I do not understand that the majority members of the committee are supporting the amendment. But what I want to say here is that I desire the RECORD to show the approval of funds for these elevators was, in my opinion, due entirely to the continued and able efforts of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Messrs. HINSHAW and POULSON) there were—ayes 59, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUHLENBERG: Page 97, line 1, strike out lines 1 to 8 inclusive.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because this relates to a matter of general interest, the Jackson Hole National Monument. You will observe from a reading of that section of the bill that all appropriations for the carrying forward of the functions of the Jackson Hole National Monument are cut out arbitrarily and without any recourse. It indicates very clearly that the purpose of this section is to stop work at Jackson Hole. The statement has been made that it does not do anything new to Jackson Hole or alter existing conditions. I do not agree with that. It says: "No part of any appropriation under this act shall be used for the performance of any new administrative function or the enforcement or issuance of any rule or regulation occasioned by the establishment of the Jackson Hole National Monument." In that wording it seems to me that it is unwise and arbitrary since we have already approved the Jackson Hole National Monument, to put in any clause in this particular bill which does not forward the work of the Jackson Hole National Monument and actually prevent work being done.

I ask your support of the amendment because I believe that it is in accord with legislation which we have previously approved.

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

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHADWICK. I desire to join my colleague from Pennsylvania in the urging of this amendment which I feel is not only wise and desirable, but it will correct what appears, superficially at least, to work an unwise and unfair operation of the law.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania made the statement that the Congress had approved the Jackson Hole National Monument. I would like to know when the Congress approved it.

This Congress passed a bill abolishing the Jackson Hole National Monument. That monument has never been approved by any Congress. When the monument was created neither the Governor, the Senators, or the Representatives in Congress from the great State of Wyoming were consulted and never at any time approved the monument. I do not know where the gentleman gets the authority for that statement. Every Congress since that monument was established by Executive order, has included in the Interior appropriation bill a similar provision to the effect that none of the funds therein appropriated may be used to administer the Jackson Hole National Monument.

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

Mr. BARRETT. I will yield to the gentleman to correct me if I am mistaken in my statement.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I ask the gentleman to yield to correct the RECORD because the actual appropriation that occasioned expenditure was made by Executive order.

Mr. BARRETT. There never has been an appropriation of any kind for the Jackson Hole National Monument, at any time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are presently endeavoring by legislation to compromise and settle this matter of the Jackson Hole National Monument. We are trying to get through some legislation whereby we can add some of the land in that monument to the Grand Teton National Park. We think the balance of the lands can be better administered by the Forest Service. Congress alone has the power to establish national parks.

There have been attempts to add the lands included in the monument to the Teton Park, but Congress failed to pass such legislation. They are attempting to do here by Executive order something that Congress alone has the right to do. Certainly I do not see any reason why this amendment should be adopted.

We have objected to the manner in which this monument was created and furthermore we propose to see that when the matter is adjusted it shall be on a basis wholly satisfactory to the people of Wyoming.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that negotiations are presently under way to work out some amicable adjustment of this Jackson Hole problem?

Mr. BARRETT. That is true. Our committee has worked out a bill that attempts to do that very thing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then it strikes me it would be extremely unfortunate to change the status quo at this particular time. The gentleman is correct that since the original proclamation no funds have been appropriated to administer it as a national monument. This will be merely continuing the status quo, and carry this limitation as it has been carried in previous years.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman. He is entirely correct.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both my colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS] and I may be permitted to extend our remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARROLL: On page 38, line 11, after "Reclamation", strike out "not to exceed $6,000,000" and insert "any sums."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, last year when this matter came up in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill, I offered an amendment to strike out the limitation this committee put in that bill. At that time I warned the committee what would happen in the Denver engineering office. I should now like to read into the record some of the testimony concerning this, and I hope I have the indulgence of the chairman of the committee because this is extremely important to Denver and to all the reclamation projects of the West.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that no doubt it is more important to Denver than it is for the good of reclamation in the Western States.

Mr. CARROLL. We shall examine that viewpoint if the gentleman will permit me to develop this argument a little bit more.

Heretofore, before the Appropriation Act of 1947, Denver was the mecca of the engineering offices of the entire world. We had over 1,000 engineers in the Denver office, doing what? Designing and planning the construction work for all the great reclamation projects throughout the West. Prior to 1948 no limitation was placed upon the funds to be used in that office. Last year the majority party placed a limitation thereon of $7,800,000. Now let me tell you what happened. I warned this committee at the time that this is what would happen. Instead of saving any money, you dispersed the personnel of that office throughout the West.

There has been some discussion here today about this body's great faith in engineers. Let me read to you from the record of the testimony of the chief engineer of the Denver reclamation office. Mr. Young, who is the chief engineer, said this. First, Mr. JENSEN asked this question:

How many engineers did you discharge or did you find it necessary to discharge because of the limitation that was placed in the 1948 bill of $7,800,000?

In the House we placed a limitation of $6,500,000. The bill went to the Senate and was returned with a limitation of $7,800,000. Now here the chief engineer, the expert who knows what he is talking about, said:

We lost through transfer and resignation something over 1,000 employees. Approximately 700 of them were from the engineering staff.

On page 656 of the record there is this further testimony:

Mr. FENTON. How did that hamper you when you transferred all of the men from Denver to the field?

I think it ought to be understood that when this limitation was placed upon the appropriation bill there was no saving of money. The designing and planning of construction work had to continue; that is the thread of the testimony throughout the entire proceeding.

What happened? When the new limitation was incorporated in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1948, it then became the duty of the Bureau of Reclamation, and in particular, the duty of the chief engineer of the Denver office of the Reclamation Bureau to conduct the business of that office within the terms of the budgetary limitation as set forth by this Congress. The personnel of that great engineering office were informed that some of them would be cut off the pay roll, and many others would be required to move themselves and their families to other areas in close proximity to some of the great reclamation projects under way. In short, great numbers of them would have to be transferred to the field.

Many men of outstanding ability who have given years of their life to the Government service were confronted with the problem of moving themselves and their families into new areas under adverse living conditions.

Here, I repeat, is the testimony:

Mr. FENTON. How did that hamper you when you transferred all of the men from Denver to the field?

Mr. MARKWELL. It cost us from 30 to 90 days in making the transfer, in getting the delegations worked out, in recruiting the personnel. We had to acquire some temporary housing, because there was no place for the people to live. And we lost personnel because they simply would not transfer.

As it developed, we arranged for a reduction in force of about 800 people, but we ended up by losing about 1,000 people, because it demoralized the group out there.

Mr. FENTON. I notice in Mr. Young's statement he dwells pretty hard on the demoralization.

Mr. MARKWELL. Yes; and it was quite serious and true. These men had been recruited, and they wanted to work for the Bureau. We had built up our design group very carefully, and then, like a bolt out of the sky, a limitation was placed upon us and we had to go through a reduction in force. And very promptly we had to try to work out transfers and to find out whether the people would transfer or not. We had to get office space; we had to get at the mechanics of actually delegating out and sending out the uncompleted designs to the field offices for them to take care of out there.

As Mr. Young has said, the Bureau has always delegated certain work, but this shotgun delegation which was forced upon us did delay us. We are behind in our design work. We are trying very desperately to catch up. But if we had not established these offices, reclamation construction would slowly have ground to a halt for lack of construction drawings.

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

Mr. CARROLL. Not at this particular time unless the gentleman will give me an extension of time for this discussion.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry. I cannot do that.

Mr. CARROLL. Then I refuse to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to straighten the gentleman out.

Mr. CARROLL. You will have opportunity to do that on your own time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, reading from page 676, here is what Chief Engineer Young said. You gentlemen have expressed such great confidence in engineers. Here is what the engineer said to this committee:

I urge that there be eliminated from the 1949 appropriation act any limitation similar to that of 1948. If it is the desire of the Congress that the Bureau's design work be decentralized, I respectfully suggest that such policy be declared by the Congress, leaving to the proper Bureau officials the determination of the procedures necessary to carry the policy into effect. It is impossible to predict at this time how far the actual decentralization can be carried either during the remaining portion of fiscal year 1948 or during 1949. We must, in any event, face the hard fact that we are now in the process of rebuilding a shattered and badly demoralized engineering organization. The high standards, integrity, and power of achievement of that organization, which have been the very basis of our national reclamation development during the past 40 years, were in the short space of 3 months disrupted and destroyed by hastily executed reduction in force actions, to the extent of jeopardizing the future of reclamation. I can assure you that it will require longer to rebuild that which was so quickly torn down. Elimination of the harmful limitation is the first necessary step toward that rebuilding. * * *

In closing, let me point out that the Secretary and the Commissioner, through their reclamation engineering organization, must shoulder a tremendous responsibility. It is their assigned task to insure to the Congress and the people of the United States the safety and performance of the public utilities created by reclamation. Congress having once approved the construction of these public works, provided funds for their execution, and established broad general policies for carrying out the work, it would seem wholly inappropriate for that Congress to tie the hands of the organization which it charges with the responsibility of carrying out the people's wishes.

In the 1948 appropriation bill, you seriously crippled one of the finest engineering offices in the whole world. You have dispersed that fine engineering force throughout the whole reclamation

area. Do not repeat that serious blunder. I sincerely trust you will adopt this amendment. The whole purpose of the amendment is to remove that budget limitation. Then if the Congress decides to decentralize, we can declare that policy preserving intact our present personnel wherever located.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the Congress in its wisdom saw fit to limit the Chief Engineer's office staff, which operates out of Denver, Colo., to the sum of $7,800,000 in the 1948 budget. What happened? Very few were released from the service of the Government. It was our intention, and it was the purpose of our committee after learning that they were overstaffed at the Denver office in the Chief Engineer's branch, as we understood it, that we should limit that office to the amount of $7,800,000. Instead of discharging the personnel who should have been discharged because of that limitation, they did move a few of these engineers and assistant engineers and what-have-you to some district offices in the West. But most of them were kept on the pay roll. So far as disrupting the organization, certainly no one testified to that effect, and if you read the entire hearings, you will find that is the truth.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that as a result of this limitation, they had to decentralize that great office and hundreds of their employees were sent out into the field?

Mr. JENSEN. My friend, that is what we were trying to do—to decentralize them and get them out on the projects where they could really do a job instead of sitting around on soft leather cushions in Denver and doing almost nothing.

Mr. CARROLL. Then, your purpose was not to reduce personnel but merely to disperse it?

Mr. JENSEN. It was to reduce personnel and also to see to it that we got some kind of a business administration out there that would carry on in a proper manner, instead of having them walking all over themselves, having assistants to the assistant to the assistant, with a lot of other high-sounding titles, just to give them a nice big salary.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman not admit that the testimony of the Chief Engineer, in response to a question propounded by you, said that designing and construction work must go on, and if it does not go on the Government will stand to lose millions of dollars, because there must be designing before there can be contracting.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, surely, I will admit that is what he said, but the facts are that we disrupted nothing. In fact, the planning and progress on the projects in the West during the last year has gone forward faster than it ever went forward before in the history of this Nation.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JENSEN. Not any further. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few moments to discuss the legislation in this bill with reference to the Bureau of Land Management. I know that the committee believes that the abolition of the regional offices will effect a saving in administration. I am very much afraid that the provisions written into this bill by the committee will have exactly the opposite effect from that which they intended.

A year ago our committe reported out a bill which followed the Nicholson report, and set up a specific program for the administration of the grazing lands in the West. The committee makes the statement in its report and in the bill that they approve the report and that they are entirely in accord with the provisions of the report. On page 9 of the report the following language may be found:

> The committee has reached the conclusion that the continuation of such offices (regional) is not desirable and it has inserted a provision in the bill prohibiting the continuation. * * * It is convinced that regional offices * * * have resulted in a bottleneck which has seriously delayed the handling of the business of the Bureau. The most glaring example of inefficiency is in the adjudication and approval of oil, grazing, and mineral leases.

Grazing leases have not been handled in the field but the decision has been made at the national level. To a greater extent, decisions and leasing of oil and mineral lands have all been made at the Washington level. It, therefore, could not be considered that elimination of regional offices would expedite the leasing of either grazing land or oil and minerals. The abolition of regional offices would necessitate increased personnel because, in place of having the five regions throughout the United States, it would be almost necessary to have 11—1 in each of the public-land States.

We have five regional offices in the West. In each of those offices there are several district offices. It is hoped that all regional offices may be located at one of the main district offices, thereby eliminating considerable expense. There are now two regional offices located within district offices, Salt Lake City, Utah, and Billings, Mont.

Each of these regional offices has an accounting department and if the work is transferred to the district offices that will mean that you have to have an accounting office in each district office.

The reduction of $583,296 from the budget request of $1,033,296 would almost entirely eliminate range examination which, of course, is one of the important features of range conservation. Actually, the cost of regional offices amounted to only $237,000 last year.

The report states further that the committee wishes to go on record as being in general harmony with the program for financing grazing administration in accordance with the formula proposed as a result of the survey made of the cost of grazing service administration and as allocated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This being the general intent of the committee, the reduction of $583,296 in the request entirely upsets the proposed formula. The committee further states that the formula set forth is sound and reasonable and it feels that funds should be allocated for this work in an amount approaching the figure proposed in the budget estimate. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary, if the program is to work, that funds in the Department above mentioned must be restored.

The provision against the transfer of activities to the field will operate against good administration. This not only prohibits the carrying out of the results of the grazing survey and the adoption of the formula established by the BAE but continues the bottleneck of the grazing, leasing function of the Bureau now in Washington because it does not permit decentralization in the field.

It certainly is not going to be an economy measure in any respect.

I hope that when this bill goes to conference the committee will not insist on this provision, because it is contrary to the bill passed by the Congress a year ago, and, in my judgment, it will result in greater expense of administration rather than a saving.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATUE OF LIBERTY

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to give the subcommittee, and especially its hard-working, able chairman, my thanks and appreciation for their recognition of the fact that the present condition of Bedloe Island is a national disgrace. Included in this bill is a sum which will give the Statue of Liberty the setting she deserves. All patriotic Americans will rejoice.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD in connection with the colloquy between the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] with relation to the bus bar policy.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this committee, under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has done a fine job. This bill recognizes the importance of the development of the natural resources of the West. It is evidence of months of hard, tedious work. The committee has rendered an outstanding service not only to the reclamation States but to the entire Nation.

This is a good appropriation bill. The amounts for actual construction and development are sizable, yet every effort has been made to carry out a program that is free from waste, unnecessary frills, and red tape. Again, I say the committee has done an outstanding job.

Perhaps if I were writing the bill I would not end up with exactly the same figures for the various projects as has the committee. That situation always exists however, and understandably. We have the assurance of the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman JENSEN, that he wants these sound projects carried on and that he will see them through. In the past the committee has always been most sympathetic and courageous when projects return to it for further money during the year. This appropriation bill means that this great program in the Republican Valley, and in the entire Missouri River Basin and elsewhere, will be carried forward. This is by far the best appropriation bill that has ever been advanced for the West.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great basins with which this bill deals is the Missouri River which drains approximately one-eighth of the United States. I want to express my appreciation to the committee for the generous way in which they have dealt with this basin. They have increased the appropriation over last year by some $29,000,000. That will provide for that program to go ahead in this basin in a splendid way. We have an area there which is largely undeveloped, an area of great resources. We need this money to develop those resources. It will mean a lot to the basin and to the whole country.

I wish to ask the chairman of the committee two questions concerning the items which appear under phase B in the table on page 30 of the report. The first is the lower Marias project, for which the estimate was $300,000 and the committee has recommended $750,000. The second is the Montana pumping project for which the estimate was $50,000 and the committee has recommended $210,000. Reference to the hearings, page 1517, and to information in my files, would indicate that the additional money should be used for construction work. I should like to ask if all of the item of $750,000 for the lower Marias is not intended for construction and if it should not appear in phase A, and if the funds for Montana pumping should not be divided so that $50,000 is available for preparatory work in phase B and the remaining $160,000 in phase A for construction work.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that matter up. I must admit that it was an oversight. When we marked up the bill we meant to bring a certain portion of this money which we had approached in phase B for the Montana pumping item and also for the Lower Marias, to bring it out of phase B up into phase A, which is construction. I have conferred with other members of the committee and we now recommend that such part of the amount allowed for these projects as may be necessary shall be available for phase A, or, in other words, construction.

Mr. D'EWART. I appreciate that very much. The committee has been very kind.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district in which there are five Indian reservations. In addition, I have a great deal of work with Indian matters as chairman of the legislative Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. In both of these capacities I have had occasion to use the services of the district office of Indian affairs at Billings, Mont., and I can testify from this experience that the conduct of Indian matters in my State has been simplified and expedited to a large extent by the Billings district office.

Probably this is due in large measure to the capabilities of Mr. Paul Fickinger, who is director of our Montana district office. He has done a fine job. In fact, you will find in the hearings on this measure that our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the committee, called the Billings office the best in the United States.

It may be that the district offices in other sections of the United States have not measured up to their responsibilities or possibilities. If this is true, the blame should not be placed upon the system itself. Part of it lies undoubtedly in the personnel of the offices, and this could be changed. Most of the responsibility, however, falls upon the Bureau itself which has failed, as the committee states in the report, to delegate to the district offices the authority and responsibility those offices should have.

One of the principal difficulties we face in our dealings in behalf of the Indians of this country is the centralization of authority in Washington. Hundreds of petty details, relating only to the activities of individual Indians, must be passed upon in Washington. As a result, they accumulate in this office and there are long delays before they are acted upon. Meanwhile, the Indian must wait and perhaps lose the economic opportunity that was available when he decided he wanted to sell some land or draw some money. These things should be settled in the field, and that is why the district offices were established. Rather than eliminate the Billings district office, we might do well to find some means of forcing the Bureau to give it the authority that will permit it to function.

There is one other benefit of the District office which occurs to me now. The district office permits the employment of a few specialists of ability which can be used throughout the district, eliminating the necessity of having a larger number, perhaps with less distinguished qualifications, assigned to individual reservations. I refer to engineers, welfare supervisors and other trained personnel.

I am glad to note that the committee approves of the Nicholson report on public-lands management, and suggests that it be followed. In Montana, where the regional land office has been at Billings, we have found its services valuable. I know many of the men assigned to the Billings district land office and they are conscientious, hard-working public servants that serve a wide area. I cannot wholly concur with the committee in regard to this office. I feel that the Nicholson report, as written into law by the Congress, should be given a chance to prove its worth.

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am personally very appreciative to the committee for their patient and favorable consideration of the requests which I and other New England members made with respect to suitable allowance for repair and rehabilitation of the fish hatchery at Nashua, N. H., which so valuably serves our section. The sum sought and provided was modest, but it will permit very necessary repairs and alterations at this time which can be supplemented in future appropriation bills.

I am gravely disturbed, however, by the provisions contained on pages 95 and 96—the so-called red rider. This language is extremely repressive in its legal implications and might very conceivably visit criminal penalties upon innocent, respectable, law-abiding American workingmen. The objective of restricting the activities and influence of Communists and other subversive groups is, of course, most commendable. But these restrictions must be written into the law within the spirit and letter of the Constitution and with due regard to the protection of the rights of the individual citizen.

A similar, though not precisely identical, provision was contained in a previous appropriation bill on labor and social security. When valid objections were raised, it will be recalled by the Members, that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], chairman of the subcommittee, gave the House complete assurance that the provision would be rewritten and corrected in conference, and I understand that has been done.

In any event, this House cannot and must not subscribe to flagrant disregard of clear constitutional and legal prohibitions, and it is, therefore, gratifying to me to note that the committee has already accepted a corrective amendment which will cure, at least in large part, the danger of injustice and hardship upon our working classes. In good faith the House could accept no other course of action, though I personally favor an even more sweeping amendment which would make it utterly impossible to apply criminal penalties against any person unless it shall clearly be shown that he has knowingly violated the statutory injunctions against subversive association and action.

It is particularly important in these times of unrest, protest, and rebellion against democracy and parliamentary and representative institutions throughout the world that we of this greatest of all democracies should hold fast and firm to the historic and time-honored safeguards which our Constitution provides for the protection of even our humblest citizen against oppression, injustice, and persecution. These repressive laws are

the technique and method of absolute totalitarian government. They have no place in a democracy. For that reason the correction of this most unwise provision is most appropriate and salutary. It squares with our high regard for the dignity and sanctity of our great and respected constitutional safeguards and will be duly noted and appreciated by the American people.

Mr. BLATNIK. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest against the drastic budget cut which the bill (H. R. 6705) makes in the 1949 appropriation for the Department of Interior. Although the Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of $459,970,835 as the minimum requirement of this agency, the Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee has insisted on reducing this amount to $375,677,591—a reduction of $84,677,244. This action on the part of the GOP leadership represents a continuation of the false economy policies of the Republican Party followed during both sessions of the Eightieth Congress, and has little relation to sound fiscal policy or genuine public economy.

The few minutes allotted to me do not permit me to discuss the many instances where budget items have been reduced to the detriment of the public welfare, and I must confine my remarks to only those items affecting the welfare of Minnesota and my district most directly. I will begin with the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines.

The Budget Bureau recommended $22,692,300 for the Bureau of Mines, but this bill appropriates only $19,194,900 for its work during the 1949 fiscal year. Now, one of the major functions of the Bureau of Mines is scientific and technological research, and the development of new methods and processes in the mining field. Such work is of great importance in the development of the mineral resources of the Nation, and it is extremely important to the future of Minnesota.

For the last 50 years, the Mesabi iron range of Minnesota has supplied at least 50 percent of the Nation's iron-ore needs, and during World War II this proportion reached 66 percent. But the supply of high-grade-iron ore in Minnesota is not unlimited—it is fast being depleted. According to Director E. W. Davis, of the University of Minnesota's mines experiment station, the high-grade ores of Mesabi will be exhausted by 1954 at the rate of wartime consumption of 80,000,000 tons per year. Other investigators have reported that at the most these high-grade ores will be gone within another generation at the present rate of consumption.

To offset this diminishing supply of high-grade ores in Minnesota, it becomes most necessary to develop our low-grade ores through improved mining operations and processing methods. Likewise we must concentrate on taconite development. The Bureau of Mines has estimated that northern Minnesota has enough taconite to supply the iron needs of this Nation for a thousand years once techniques for its utilization have been perfected. We have made considerable progress in this direction already, but more research is necessary to speed this development.

To Prof. E. W. Davis, director of the mines experiment station at the University of Minnesota, goes the major share of credit for the progress made thus far in utilizing this hard rock called taconite as a commercially feasible source of premium high-grade magnetite iron ore. Working patiently for years with inadequate laboratory facilities, Professor Davis has carried out the basic experimental work which has made possible the present proposal for the construction of a large-scale taconite plant.

Two or three independent mining companies have gotten together to organize the Reserve Mining Co., which proposes to erect a taconite plant north of Beaver Bay on northeastern Minnesota's famous Lake Superior North Shore. This plant will be capable of producing 2,500,000 tons of taconite concentrate annually. Such a plant requires an enormous capital investment. Furthermore, it takes four to five times as much labor to beneficiate a ton of taconite ore as is required to mine one ton of open-pit direct-shipment ore. Enormous amounts of low-cost electric power are also necessary for the profitable development of such an enterprise. Even from this brief summary it is apparent that at the present state of technology, the process of converting taconite into high-grade ore is going to be extremely expensive. More extensive research and development work is necessary before large-scale utilization of taconite can become a reality, and upon this development rests the future economic life of northeastern Minnesota, and the future source of iron ore within our Nation's boundaries.

Minnesota must also find ways and means to use her enormous peat deposits. Approximately half of the Nation's peat resources are found in Minnesota, most of which is located in St. Louis County where 6 billion tons await development. In spite of the need to use these deposits, there is only one man in the whole United States who is devoting full time to peat research, and he is employed by the Minnesota Resources Rehabilitation Commission. Yet a broad program of peat research would lead to the utilization of these deposits through advanced techniques, and provide an unlimited amount of cheap fuel for the future industrialization of the region.

The development of Minnesota's low-grade ores, taconite, and peat requires the appropriation of adequate funds to continue and expand the mineral-mining-research program conducted by the Bureau of Mines. Last year's drastic reduction of funds for this agency sharply curtailed this research program at a time when these investigations should have been expanded, and I had hoped to see Congress make up for last year's mistake by granting additional funds for 1949.

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues never learn from past mistakes, and choose to repeat the same short-sighted action again this year. The appropriation for the Bureau of Mines is nearly $4,000,000 below budget estimates, which means that there will be $25,000 less for mineral mining research, and $190,000 less for the investigation of domestic mineral deposits, than the Budget Bureau recommended. The failure of the Republican leadership to recognize the need for more money for mining research and mineral development is a serious blow to our plans to develop our low-grade ores, taconite, and peat in Minnesota. This short-sighted policy of economizing at the expense of the Bureau of Mines and all mineral development is one which I must sharply disagree.

I also want to point out that the Appropriation Committee's action in reducing the funds for the Bureau of Indian Affairs by nearly $10,000,000 below budget estimates represents a profound disservice to the State of Minnesota. Last year's budget cuts seriously jeopardized the Indian educational program in the State, and created serious fiscal deficits in this program. Likewise, the Indian health program was undermined with not enough funds being made available to care for many cases of active tuberculosis in sanitariums. This created a danger to the health of entire communities. But the GOP is so interested in saving money that the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be forced to continue with a reduced budget again next year, even though this means curtailing Indian education and health services.

Time will permit me to mention only one more example of Republican false economy policy, and that is found in the Fish and Wildlife Service Appropriation. The Budget Bureau recommended $11,587,200 for the 1949 fiscal year—the minimum amount necessary to carry out the functions of that agency. Since Minnesota is an important commercial fishing State, the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service are important to us. This agency also plays a big role in our efforts to conserve our other wildlife resources. Last year's budget slashes resulted in the closing of the Lester River fish hatchery at Duluth, the curtailment of wildlife research and a decrease in conservation work. The failure of Congress to follow the recommendations of the Budget Bureau again this year, and the reduction of its estimates by over $2,000,000, means that the Service must continue to operate with an inadequate budget with a resulting decrease in the volume of vital conservation work and wildlife research.

In conclusion, I want to say again that this Republican policy of economizing at the expense of vital Government functions which effects the public welfare is not true Government economy—rather it represents a penny-wise and pound-foolish attitude which is contrary to the general welfare.

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

If the Committee will bear with me I will not take my full 5 minutes, but I am duty bound to call attention of the House to the fact that although the Committee approved every cent that was asked for the Navajo Indians for welfare work,

$120,000, that, in my opinion, is not enough. The Department asked for only $120,000 and I am not blaming the Committee for not allowing more; but the fact is that in this Congress year after year the Indian Office has not asked for near enough for that purpose. Consequently, last year, as you will recall, we had to appropriate supplemental funds to the tune of $500,000. That is going to happen again. I hope that by the time the bill gets to conference the Committee will have the true facts presented independently of the Indian Office if necessary and that proper provision is timely made. The Indian Office in Washington may not know that they are insufficient—apparently they do not; but the superintendent of the reservation and all those who work in the reservation or have studied conditions out there know that $120,000 is not going to take care of the situation on the Navajo Indian Reservation. It seems that year after year a ceiling is placed on the total they can request, and the Washington Indian Office takes it out on the item of welfare and relief for Indians. It is time that somebody in that Office had the courage to tell Congress what the superintendent out there tells us but is not allowed to tell Congress. I am tired of this, and have come to the conclusion that the reservation should be placed out of the hands of the Indian Office.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department has done a splendid job on this bill from an over-all point of view and I wish to commend the members for it. For the information and consideration of the membership, however, I would like the RECORD to contain the following facts on the Economic Section of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Economic Section of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Branch of Commercial Fisheries, operates under a present appropriation of $16,400 per year. For the same work, the Department of Agriculture spends $4,100,000.

The economic studies on fisheries include price histories, cost studies, wages and share income of fishermen, investments, foreign competition, foreign trade, wholesale and retail distribution, and auxiliary industries.

If one would give to the fisheries an amount comparable to what is given to Agriculture, this Section should have $59,000 on the basis of a comparison of the volume of fishery products to the volume of agriculture products.

For the fiscal year 1949, only $13,100 was added to this existing $16,400. This $13,100 is composed of $5,600 special studies which are described in the following justification, and $7,500 economic research in Alaska, also explained in the following justification:

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION OF ITEMS ON ECONOMIC RESEARCH DENIED BY THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 1948

Study of cost of production, investments, and so forth, $5,600: Studies under this item are needed to give basic information to the fishery industries and to legislative bodies. The studies intended under this item would show capital investments in the fishery industries of the United States which never were investigated while the neighboring country, Canada, publishes, from month to month, capital investments and their variations.

Such data in the United States are necessary to give the industry a basis for planning, expansion, and contraction, and, also, to give to executive and legislative bodies a basis for decisions on the formulation of statutes and regulations, for example, in the field of taxation and in the field of international trade.

The studies under this item also include studies on labor and management interrelations and on fishery labor in general which are important in evaluating the importance of certain legislative acts as, for example, the Social Security Act of 1946 and the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, with respect to the fishery industries. Such studies in in the field of fishery labor are, therefore, important because fishermen regularly are not paid by the hour or week, but they share in the results of the catch. Share agreements have developed all over the country and vary from area to area. There is no central office in the United States which could give information to the industry or to the legislative and executive authorities about the content of these share agreements and the variations as they affect the different areas.

Knowledge on these subject matters is imperative for future legislation in the field of labor-management relations and in the field of Federal and State tax legislation.

Further studies under this item include cost of production, which would give basic information to the fishery industries on how to adjust their fishery and plant operations to meet the averages which would become known by such studies. Adjustments following such studies would result in higher efficiency of the industry as a whole and it would result in lower prices of fish and fishery products for the consumer, as well as adjustment and modernization of the auxiliary industries which deliver equipment and machinery for fish processing.

Economic research in Alaska, $7,500: Under this item studies were intended on cost of production, distribution, and transportation rates, on wages and on labor-employment relations in Alaska.

Very little is known about the economic conditions of the fishery industries in Alaska. Generally it is known that they operate quite different from the continental fishery industries. Labor is hired for the season, sometimes at a seasonal wage, in addition to which room and board is given.

Fishermen are paid by a share in the catch. However, very often the value of the catch is not determined according to poundage of fish, but number of fish caught.

It is imperative to make studies on the actual dollars-and-cents income of management and labor in the fishery industries in Alaska to give the industries themselves a basis for future planning and to give the legislative and executive authorities information basic to the formulation of statutes and regulations, especially in the field of taxation.

Transportation problems in Alaska were intended to be special subject matter of study under this item which was denied by the House Appropriations Committee. Among the cost of production, transportation costs play a very great part, since not only labor and machinery have to be transported to the places of production, but also the processed products have to be transported at least 800 miles to find the nearest distribution center. The importance of the maritime service and shipping for the fishery industries should be investigated, transportation rates studied and the comparative position of the Alaska fishery industries on the basis of these studies should be evaluated. All this is not possible if the denial stands.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Ohio) having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, 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. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. Ross) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO PROCEED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. RIZLEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 619, Rept. No. 2068), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6341), to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CLAIMS ARISING AS RESULT OF EXPLOSIONS AT PORT CHICAGO, CALIF.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 669) to provide a method of paying all unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike "all" and insert "those."

Page 2, line 11, strike out all after "investigated" down to and including "Navy" in line 13 and insert "and reported to the Congress with recommendations by the Secretary of the Navy in accordance with the provisions of said Public Law 423."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LULA WILSON NEVERS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers, 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 all after "States", down to and including "1944" in line 11 and insert "out of the rental of one Link-Belt crawler crane under rental agreement No. 75, entered into April 29, 1941, and the use and handling of such crane at and during shipment between the Iowa ordnance plant and Kansas ordnance plant of the War Department."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED E. GROSS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2131) for the relief of Fred E. Gross, 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, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine on the merit and to render, in accordance therewith, judgment upon the claim of Fred E. Gross, of Lonoke, Ark., against the United States, arising under or growing out of the use by the United States in ordnance plants of a packing box for vane assemblies and bomb fuzes, which box was originated, designed, and patented (shown and described in his patent No. 2,389,358) by said Fred E. Gross. The Court of Claims is directed to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the said claim, notwithstanding any prior administrative determination, any statute of limitation, or any provision of law which would otherwise bar this action, or any provision or rule of law which would otherwise bar a Federal employee from instituting such action; and the citation for distinguished service issued Fred E. Gross is not to be considered as compensation or sufficient award or in lieu of compensation.

"SEC. 2. Any suit upon such claim brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS A. W. ELDER

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3805) for the relief of Thomas A. W. Elder, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "$9,000" and insert "$6,500."

Line 15, strike out "inclusive" and insert "inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts 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 these claims, 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 SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. OWENS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the Lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2;

H. R. 5874. An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 26, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5298. An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1596. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $4,021,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 681); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1597. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. COLE of Missouri: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4873. A bill to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5416. A bill to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 619. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6341, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2069). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2060. An act for the relief of Edgar Wikner Percival; without amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Edmund Huppler; without amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4994. A bill for the relief of William C. Pollett; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1281. An act for the relief of James B. Walsh; with amendments (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased; with amendments (Rept. No. 2063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1902. A bill for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2431. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Gladys Janow, the widow of David Jefferson Janow, for herself and seven minor children, namely, Vernon Janow, James Jefferson Janow, Virginia Janow, Hazel Janow, William Janow, Patsy Janow, and Jefferson Janow, said claim growing out of the death of said David Jefferson Janow, who was killed on or about the 25th day of January 1944 while working at the Enid Army Airfield at Enid, Okla., when he was struck by a United States Army airplane being driven by Army student pilots at said Army airfield base; with amendments (Rept. No. 2065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6186. A bill for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6428. A bill to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2067). 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. BEALL:

H. R. 6723. A bill to prohibit the purchase of beer on credit by retailers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6724. A bill to impose an additional duty on imports from Great Britain as long as Great Britain continues to assist powers waging war against Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6725. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to establishment of uniform permile rates for the transportation, by railroad or by railroad and water, of grain and grain products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 6726. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 6727. A bill to permit religious or charitable societies to import musical instruments free of duty in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 6728. A bill to authorize medical and hospital service for those employed in the maritime service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6729. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6730. A bill to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 6731. A bill for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 6732. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in poliomyelitis and other diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution instructing the managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on H. R. 5607; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Con. Res. 210. Concurrent resolution to establish a special joint committee to study and report on the value of aviation education in the standard curricula of elementary and secondary public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 616. Resolution to provide for an investigation by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the hospitalization of veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Res. 617. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to have printed not more than 3,000 copies of each study supplementary to the report on the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism prepared by its Subcommittee No. 5; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Res. 618. Resolution authorizing studies by a joint board of Army, Navy, and Reclamation engineers to investigate and report on the feasibility from the standpoint of national defense and other beneficial purposes of the conservation of fresh water at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MACK introduced a bill (H. R. 6733) for the relief of Catherine A. Glesener, which was referred 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:

2023. By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Nevada, with reference to the en-

dorsement of H. R. 2455, National Minerals Development and Conservation Act of 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2024. By the SPEAKER: Petition of MacArthur for America Club of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to bringing MacArthur back to America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2025. Also, petition of W. A. Bloom, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2026. Also, petition of Mrs. Fannie E. Thomas, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2027. Also, petition of J. C. Michael, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 20, 1948)

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

Rev. John T. Reed, pastor, De Kalb Presbyterian Church, De Kalb, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we need Thee in all of life. Thou art the source of all our blessings, and in this moment we turn to Thee with thankfulness of heart and in adoration. We confess that we have often been weak and have fallen below the standards of life that we have set and, with the apostle of old, realize that when we would do good evil is present. We give Thee thanks that in those moments Thou art ready to guide us aright. We beseech Thee for that guidance for the Nation, and especially for those who are its leaders.

In the days ahead pilot us by Thy spirit into the ways of righteousness and peace. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 27, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 28, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following joint resolution:

S. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1486) to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 669. An act to provide a method of paying all unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy; and

H. R. 3805. An act for the relief of Thomas A. W. Elder.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; and

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Fred E. Gross.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained consent for the Committee on the Judiciary, which is now considering the Mundt-Nixon bill, to meet during the session of the Senate today.

He also asked and obtained consent for the Small Business Committee to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained consent for the Foreign Relations Committee to meet at 2 o'clock today.

Mr. SMITH asked and obtained consent for the Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to hold a hearing this afternoon.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

(For conference report, see p. 6458, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, 1948.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is to proceed today.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 28, 1948, at the hour of 12 o'clock noon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, and that at the hour of 3:30 o'clock on said day a vote be taken on the question of agreeing to the report.

Ordered further, That of the intervening time 1 hour be allotted to those favoring the conference report, to be controlled by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and 2½ hours be allotted to those opposing the said report, to be controlled by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is in charge of the time for the proponents of the conference report, and the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is in charge of the time for the opponents, if I may suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged proportionately in the proper percentage to the proponents and opponents?

Mr. REED. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is agreeable to me.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll, the time to be charged proportionately to each side.

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

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McMahon	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	White
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Feazel	Maybank	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Moore	Young
Fulbright	Morse	
George	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent order, I was given charge of the time to be allotted to Senators in opposition to the conference report. I am compelled to be absent from