×Lt. Col. Samuel Lusker McCroskey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Oliver Boone Bucher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
× Lt. Col. Clarence Ames Martin, Infantry (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Francis Stuart Swett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Henning Linden, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Taylor Brotherton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Miles Whitney Kresge, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ralph de Poix Terrell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Dumas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Emerson Keatley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Don Magruder Scott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Robert Edward Wysor, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Harold Day, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George William Outland, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Mead Silkman, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Loren Archibald Wetherby, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Bernard Butler McMahon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Edwin Fingarson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Albert Rudelius, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Lee Blanton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Brady, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Porter Pise Wiggins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Gilbert Xavier Cheves, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Edward Corkill, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Thomas Zellars, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Emons Bert Whisner, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Hugh Tullock Mayberry, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harry Staples Robertson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Wynne, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Olaf Phillips Winningstad, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Winfred Charles Green, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Marion Irwin Voorhes, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col George Van Wyck Pope, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Ellsworth Butler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Joel Rankin Burney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Milton Burton Persons, Signal Corps (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Homer Case, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Earl Cranston Ewert, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Bird Little, Infantry.
×Lt. Col. Guy Cummins McKinley, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Hugh McClune, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Harold Pearson Gibson, Infantry (temporary colone).
×Lt. Col Gilbert Everhard Parker, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Francis Beeston Laurenson Myer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John George Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Gustave Villaret, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Sanders Van Deusen, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Joe Jene Miller, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Ernest Dahlquist, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. William Eugene Farthing, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Tom Sherman Brand, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. James Robinson Urquhart, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Morrill Watson Marston, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. William Edward Bergin, Adjutant General's Department (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. John Calvin Butner, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edward Stanley Ott, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Melvin Leslie McCreary, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Herman Hollie Felix Gossett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Murray Matthews Montgomery, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Lester Johnson Whitlock, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Harry Lee Campbell, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Kay Christmas, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Harvey Edward, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Leo James McCarthy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Arthur Williams, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. George Price Hays, Field Artillery (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Harry Squire Wilbur, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ralph Julian Canine, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Timothy Asbury Pedley, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Donald Ross Dunkle, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Chester Earl Davis, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Turner Bowden, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Holmes Gill Paullin, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Ray Edison Porter, Infantry (temporary major general).
×Lt. Col. Clarence Clemons Park, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Glenn Smith Finley, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Volney Rattan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Rosswell Eric Hardy, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Lloyd Zuppann, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. John Kirkland Rice, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. James Holden Hagan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. Charles Spurgeon Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

NOTE.—Dates of rank are omitted from this nomination. The first 349 nominees to be promoted will be given date of rank as December 28, 1945, to fill original vacancies authorized by Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, 1945. The remaining nominees will be given dates of rank appropriate to the vacancies they will fill. The dates of rank are omitted in order to assure that 349 officers may be promoted to fill the vacancies authorized by Public Law 281. If any of these officers should retire or die prior to promotion it would necessitate renominating the remaining officers in order to change their dates of rank to correspond with the vacancies.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory.

O Conqueror, Thou who cometh in the name of the Lord, who didst go through the rejoicing multitude to a hill where stood a cross, make us, we beseech Thee, sharers in thy devoted spirit, as we remember the glory of Thy triumphant entry. Give us the faith which supported Thee and led Thee onward in Thine appointed mission. By gentleness, by selfless service, help us to breathe Thy spirit and interpret to men Thy rule of life, to the end that the kingdom of God may come upon the earth and be exalted in human hearts and homes. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 28, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to provide for the printing and distribution of certain matter relating to congressional activities, authorized by section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Federal Security Agency.
7. Federal Works Agency.
8. National Archives.
9. Railroad Retirement Board.
10. Tennessee Valley Authority.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 29, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to yesterday, the Clerk did on this day receive from the Secretary of the Senate a message in writing attesting to the fact that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 918) entitled "An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective-service records, and for other purposes."

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 28, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate the engrossed bill of the House of Representatives (H. J. Res. 159) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having passed the Senate without amendment March 28 (legislative day of March 24), 1947.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on March 28, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 28, 1947:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, March 28, 1947, he signed enrolled bills and joint resolutions as follows:

On March 28, 1947:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard;

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

On March 29, 1947:

S. 918. An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective service records, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. Owing to the fact that a conference report must be passed on in the House as early as possible in order that it may go to the Senate and become law today, the Chair feels that 1-minute speeches and requests for extensions must wait until after the disposition of this conference report.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, 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 matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23); the Stabilization Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 765); title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177), and the amendment to existing law made thereby; title XIV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177); and section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), all as amended and extended, shall continue in effect with respect to sugar to and including October 31, 1947, except that authority to continue inventory controls over other than household users may be exercised to and including March 31, 1948: *Provided, however,* That—

"(1) the authority contained herein shall not be deemed (i) to permit the allocation or rationing of any product (other than the allocation of such product imported or brought into the continental United States) unless a regulation providing for allocation or rationing thereof was in effect on February 18, 1947, or (ii) to permit price control over any product unless a price-control regulation with respect thereto was in effect on February 18, 1947;

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any provision of law referred to above, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(3) no provision of section 204 (d) or (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall apply (i) in any proceeding, involving a regulation or order with respect to sugar, in which an injunction or other order of a court is hereafter applied for, or (ii) in any proceeding, under section 37 of the Criminal Code, which is based on a conspiracy involving any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(4) in the case of any regulation or order with respect to sugar, no protest may be hereafter filed under section 203 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and

"(5) hereafter no person shall be required to secure a license, and no license shall be issued to any person, under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, for the purpose of providing for the enforcement of any regulation or order relating to sugar.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of this Act,—

"(1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 787);

"(2) shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than thirty-five pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals fifty pounds of refined sugar per capita; and

"(3) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available, for other than provisional-allotment users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this Act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

"SEC. 2. Prior to the expiration of the authority granted by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all controls with respect to any product over which control is authorized by this Act when he determines that the supplies of sugar are sufficient to warrant such action.

"SEC. 3. (a) The powers, functions, and duties of (1) the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made thereby; (2) the President or any executive department under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940; (3) the Price Administrator under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; and (4) the President and the Price Administrator under the Stabilization Act of 1942, all as amended and extended (and irrespective of what officer, department, or agency may be now exercising any such power, function, or duty) are, insofar as they relate to sugar, hereby transferred to and shall be executed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) Every order, directive, rule or regulation relating to any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section, issued by any officer, department, or agency heretofore performing such power, function, or duty, which is not in conflict with the provisions of this Act and which is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue in full force and effect, according to its terms, unless and until modified or rescinded by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(c) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, and the property, available for the use of any officer, department, or agency in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section or for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of any power, function, or duty so transferred, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of such powers, functions, or duties. In determining the amount to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. Such personnel as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be required may also be transferred temporarily to the Department of Agriculture pending termination of the powers, functions, and duties transferred by subsection (a) of this section. The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions, and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any order, directive, rule, or regulation continued in effect by section 3 (b) of this Act or issued in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by section 3 (a) of this Act.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this Act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

"(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than two years in the case of a violation of subsection (b) and for not more than one year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this Act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or agency.

"(b) The term 'sugar' means any grade or type of saccharine product derived from sugarcane, sugar beets, or corn, including liquid sugar, sirups, molasses, or mixtures thereof, and sugar-containing products, which contain sucrose, dextrose, or levulose.

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Surplus Property Act of 1944;' the following: 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947;'.

"(b) This Act may be cited as the 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommend in the accompanying conference report:

The substitute agreed to in conference is similar in most respects to the joint resolution as it passed the House but there are differences which are explained below in this statement.

Section 1 of the joint resolution as passed by the House, after providing for temporary continuance of specified provisions of law, included the following provision:

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any such provision of law, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;"

In the conference substitute the words "under any provision of law referred to above" have been used instead of the words "under any such provision of law". This change is merely to make it perfectly clear that the provisions of law referred to are the ones cited in the introductory language to section 1.

Section 1 of the joint resolution passed by the House contained a subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the allocation and rationing authority transferred to him by section 3 of this Act, shall in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new sugar users, and for the needs of those who have no base period history."

This provision has been omitted from the conference substitute, but in lieu thereof provisions have been included providing that the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of the act, (1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944; and (2) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available for other than provisional-allotment users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

The provision referred to in clause (1) of the preceding paragraph is taken from the Senate amendment, and merely makes more specific the intent of one of the provisions of the House joint resolution which is omitted from the conference substitute. The provision referred to in clause (2) of the preceding paragraph is a modification of section 4 of the Senate amendment. That section provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should make available not less than 50,000 tons of refined sugar, for other than provisional-allotment users, during the period from April 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948, to provide for the same needs (other than the needs of hardship cases) which are to be provided for under the provision of the conference substitute here being discussed. The reduction from 50,000 to 25,000 tons made by this provision is in consideration of the fact that the amount referred to in the Senate amendment would have been allocated over a full year, whereas the provision in the conference substitute makes provision for a period from the date of the enactment of this act until October 31, 1947. In providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make such sugar available in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, and in making provision for hardship cases, this provision of the conference substitute follows the provision of the House joint resolution.

It is the intention that the Secretary, in exercising his allocation powers under this legislation, shall make just and reasonable provision for meeting need for sugar to avoid wastage of milk and other food products. The conferees are confident that such provision will be made because of assurances given to the Senate committee and referred to in the report of that committee on Senate Joint Resolution 58.

There is also included in the conference substitute a provision taken from the Senate amendment requiring that the Secretary of Agriculture in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than 35 pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals 50 pounds of refined sugar per capita.

Section 1 of the joint resolution as passed by the House contained the following subsection which is omitted from the conference substitute:

"(c) Nothing herein shall restrict the import of products of consumer size containers of not more than three pounds net each or more than one-half United States liquid gallons each, providing importers of such products shall obtain certification from the proper government officials of the exporting country that products so shipped shall have been produced out of domestic quota sugar."

In that part of section 3 of the joint resolution as passed by the House, which dealt with the temporary transfer of employees, the following proviso was included:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall in anywise be construed to violate any of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944."

In lieu of this proviso there has been included in the conference substitute the following provision taken substantially from the Senate amendment:

"The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act."

Section 6 of the conference substitute makes an amendment to the Administrative Procedure Act so as to continue, with respect to the exercise of the authority transferred by this legislation, the exemption from such act which is now applicable in the case of the exercise of such authority. This section also provides that this act may be cited as the "Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947."

The Senate amendment contained a subsection 3 (d) providing for continuance in effect of orders, directives, rules, and regulations, pertaining to sugar, for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or proceeding with respect to violations, liabilities, or appeals. This provision has been omitted from the conference substitute solely on the ground that it was deemed unnecessary. By other provisions of the conference substitute orders, directives, rules, and regulations pertaining to sugar are continued in effect, and there is nothing in the conference substitute which would prevent them from being in effect for the purposes referred to in the Senate section 3 (d). Furthermore, section 13 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 1, section 29) provides that—

"The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing Act shall expressly so provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability. The expiration of a temporary statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the temporary statute shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability."

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House discloses that about the only changes from the House bill are in the interest of clarity. The bill as adopted by the conferees is substantially the bill as it passed the House.

Some questions have arisen as to whether sugar will be made available to new users, those without a sufficient base period, and hardship cases. The conferees have agreed that the Secretary of Agriculture should make sugar available to new users, to those without a base period, and for the needs of hardship cases in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program. In order that there might be no question that the Secretary of Agriculture should make available sugar for canning purposes, and for the prevention of spoilage and wastage of food, you will find on page 6 of the conference report, in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, substantially the same language as was contained in the House report, which clearly defines the intent of the Congress to making sugar available to prevent spoilage and wastage of food, in which it provides:

It is the intention that the Secretary, in exercising his allocation powers under this legislation, shall make just and reasonable provision for meeting need for sugar to avoid wastage of milk and other food products.

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I was interested in that language contained on page 6 of the conference report. May I ask the gentleman if the sugar to be allocated under the Secretary's authority is a part of the 25,000 tons referred to in the previous paragraph, or is that in addition to the 25,000 tons?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The sugar made available under the 25,000 tons is for provisional use, and it is my interpretation that the amount of sugar made available for hardship cases and new users is in addition to and not a part of the 25,000 tons.

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

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

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what the per capita amount of refined sugar is that is now being used by the people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think, perhaps, I will have to divide that answer in two different parts. It is expected that this year there will be about 93 pounds available per capita as against a normal of 103 pounds. Now, that is for all domestic purposes, commercial as well as household purposes. Last year there was allocated 25 pounds per capita per annum. Under the estimate made for this year which, as I said, is within 10 pounds per capita of normal production, there is no question at all but that the householder shall be allocated at least 35 pounds per capita. The Senate wrote a provision in here that sugar should be allocated to household users on the basis of not less than 35 pounds per capita, and that any increase in the estimate should be allocated to the household users up to 50 pounds per capita. They did not have to do that. It might be a redundancy, but is an added protection which assures that each consumer, for household purposes, separate and apart from industrial purposes, shall get at least 35 pounds per capita. They possibly will get 50 pounds per capita, and perhaps more than that.

I do not think this sugar problem, Mr. Speaker, is nearly as serious as we have presumed. We are getting along splendidly, and I think one of our problems next year is going to be—I hope next year, anyway—that we will have so much sugar that there will not be any question of rationing; it will be a question of getting rid of the surplus.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is my understanding correct that if we are allocated 50 pounds and it can be proven that we cannot put up our fruits with the 50 pounds allocated to us we are entitled to have more sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is very clearly the intention of the Congress that every possible attempt should be made to provide not only any additional sugars which are available but any sugar which is necessary to prevent wastage and spoilage. Of course we intend that there shall be made available adequate sugar for preventing wastage and spoilage of foods.

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

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

Mr. RIZLEY. If I understand this conference report correctly, you continue the rationing of sugar until October 31 of this year. Then you continue the inventory control over sugar until next March.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. Control over commercial and industrial inventories is permitted until March 31, 1948.

Mr. RIZLEY. Following the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], may I inquire who makes the determination as to whether the housewife who needs more than 50 pounds of sugar for canning shall have the sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RIZLEY. Has the Secretary of Agriculture now a set-up in his office to take over the handling and control of sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We provide for the transfer of appropriations and personnel to him, subject to the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. RIZLEY. In other words, you take the present employees of the OPA, or whatever its successor was, and transfer them to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of further rationing and allocating the sugar up until October 31?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In practice it will be whether the Secretary of Agriculture wants them and whether the Bureau of the Budget will certify them as necessary, but I may say to the gentleman that the problem we have had has not been with the clerks and stenographers of OPA, it has been on the policy-making level, at the top. From now on, the policies with respect to the allocation and pricing of sugar will be under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton Anderson, in whom I think we have more confidence than we have had in the administrators of OPA.

Mr. RIZLEY. There is one other question I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, who has been very familiar with the whole rationing program from the beginning. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he observed that he did not think this sugar question is now nearly as serious as a lot of people seem to think it is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is becoming decreasingly serious every day. I did not want to indicate that there is no serious sugar shortage now.

Mr. RIZLEY. In view of that statement, that it is not as serious as a lot of people seem to think it is, does not the gentleman believe the time is about here when we can get rid of these controls put on by virtue of the war? If it is not a serious matter, does not the gentleman believe it would be a pretty good idea to give the housewives of the country a little relief by just doing away with this thing now, in its entirety instead of continuing it on piecemeal, part of it until October 31 and the balance of it up until March 1948?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is just the problem. Because there is a world shortage of sugar at the present time, if we were to remove controls at the present time, it is very doubtful whether the housewife would be getting much sugar 30 days from now. We would invite competition between the commercial and industrial users and the housewife to the prejudice of household users. It is for the purpose of assuring the housewife that she is going to get an equitable supply of sugar that we are continuing this program until October 31, with the hope that production will be sufficient by that time to allow the controls to come off in an orderly manner without too much shock to our sugar industry and that part of the economy which is more or less dependent on sugar.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the excuse the controllers always give, shortage. We will continue to have shortages so long as we attempt to control our economy by New Deal planners. And so long as we continue to attempt to feed the whole world.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I inquire of the gentleman if his committee is watching the present price situation as it affects consumers generally with a view to taking action unless there is a reduction in the cost of living?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are watching it with tremendous interest.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the intention of taking action, if necessary, for the protection of the consumers' interest?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it is necessary; but I think industry is taking the action which is necessary to bring about reduced prices.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice they are failing to cooperate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Industry is producing goods more rapidly at the present time than they ever produced before even in wartime. Industry is producing goods so rapidly in the United States today that our capacity for production really amazes us. One of the greatest problems today in many lines is the question of markets for our surplus production. That involves a great danger and that is why the gentleman and myself gave some consideration to making foreign credit available so that when we have these surpluses, probably this year and next year, we will have markets for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose originally in asking the gentleman to yield was in connection with the October 31st date. That is based upon the hope that there will be such an increase in production that there will be no sharp increase in price levels.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the purposes of the record, would we be able to ascertain by early July whether or not that hope will materialize so far as production is concerned?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that we would be able to determine that with any degree of definiteness in July and perhaps not before August or September. But the date of October 31 is predicated upon the fact that the world-crop figures will then be pretty well known, and we will know just about what the domestic crop is going to amount to. So that, by October 31, if we have even a normal year this year, it is thought that we can safely take controls off.

I do not think we can tell definitely by July because many things might happen between July and September. By the latter part of August or the fore part of September, we should know within a few hundred thousand tons about how much sugar is going to be available in the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. I recognize the situation and, of course, the conference report should be agreed to. But the thought I had in mind was that if there was a rapid increase in the cost of living, we would have to take some action for the protection of consumers somehow or other along this line. Is that a fair inference to draw?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Perhaps so, but I do not think the danger lies so much in an abnormal increase in the price of sugar. When controls come off in October, even if we are still in reasonably short supply, sugar will be coming on the market, so shortly after the danger would lie more in the fact that the commercial and industrial users might bid for the available supplies to the prejudice of the housewife. That is the reason why we kept this provision here for the permissive control of inventories so that the Secretary of Agriculture can say to an industrial user of sugar, "You usually keep a 60-day supply of sugar on hand and, therefore, you should not have more than a 60-day supply of sugar on hand until March 31, 1948."

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was in my district on Saturday and Sunday. Family after family said to me, "We have no sugar in our sugar bowls." I assured them that I believed it was the feeling of the chairman of the committee that there would be more sugar for canning and more sugar available, and that there must be more sugar than was anticipated because Dr. Marshall, of the Department of Agriculture, promised me before this legislation was introduced that the farmers would be given their regular supply of sugar to be used to make condensed milk out of their skimmed milk. Apparently, therefore, there is more sugar than was anticipated. But I know the gentleman is working on that. I voted rather reluctantly to retain controls until October 31, but I had faith in the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We did stress the necessity for making sugar available to prevent food wastage and spoilage. I may say the family sugar bowls will be replenished tomorrow. I think there is another stamp made valid tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman usually gets what he goes after.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the lady from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there any relief in this bill for retail dealers in sugar who have had their stamps lost or stolen, to the end that they cannot supply their customers with even a small supply of sugar at the present time? What, if anything, has been done about a situation of that nature?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think there is a little relief, at least, to them in subsection (2) of section (b), on page 2 of the conference report, where provision is made for the needs of hardship cases, needs of new industrial users, and then in parentheses you will find this language:

> With particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts.

The retailer would have too little sugar for two reasons: Because he has lost his stamps, because he perhaps has cashed counterfeit stamps, but that in itself would be a hardship case which the Secretary of Agriculture would have to give consideration to. Then, if in a town where there are perhaps only two grocery stores which has had an unusual increase in population, due to population shift, throwing an added burden on those two grocers, that condition would have to be considered as creating a hardship, and the Secretary of Agriculture would have to give consideration to the needs of that community. In that manner the retail grocers would have their allotments increased proportionate as the population has increased.

Mr. JENSEN. Then the gentleman does feel there is some relief in this bill in the case which I have mentioned?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; if it is properly administered, there will be substantial relief, and I am certain it will be properly administered.

Mr. JENSEN. I received this morning a petition from several hundred housewives in the city of Shenandoah, Iowa, and the surrounding community, in which they point out very carefully that they are worried about the sugar condition, and that sugar is very short at the present time. I understood the gentleman to say it was not a very serious situation at the present time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is becoming less serious every day.

Mr. JENSEN. But will this thing be straightened out in time to take care of the canning season—that is, the canning of fruit in the country?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The housewife will be much better off with this bill than she would be without it.

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Mr. JENSEN. Categorically, just how much better off do you think she will be?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the first place, she will be assured of 10 pounds, per capita, more than she had last year, with the hope that if the sugar production is as it is estimated, somewhat better than normal, she will get up to 50 pounds as against 25 pounds last year. She will get that between now and October at that rate. Then, on October 31, all controls go off, and I hope she will be able to get all the sugar she will want after that date. There is some canning to be done, of course, at that time. It runs into November, I understand, although I quite agree that most canning is done before that. But most of the canning this year will be done at a time when sugar is under control, having the effect of guaranteeing that she will get much more sugar than she got last year.

Mr. JENSEN. And getting it soon—in plenty of time for canning, say within the next month or two?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We hope so. I think the fact that they are giving the housewives a little bonus on tomorrow, April 1, indicates that they realize that the sugar situation will be better than that which existed 2 or 3 months ago.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. From the realistic standpoint, I understand the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Agriculture will make additional allocations to prevent wastage. How does that apply to the housewife or someone who wants to use sugar to can fruit to prevent its going to waste? The individual cannot take it up with the Secretary of Agriculture. Are we going to have an OPA in the communities to determine this additional allocation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are not going to have any more OPA as far as sugar is concerned.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Where is the housewife going to get in touch with the Secretary of Agriculture to get this allocation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture probably will not deal with the individual housewife.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. How is she going to get the additional sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He will deal generally with the problem when it arises. If there is not sugar available to meet the needs for preserving food at the time of its harvest the Secretary of Agriculture will know the needs of the housewives and then he will make arrangements to validate coupons for increased amounts of sugar.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. What I am trying to get at is, How is the housewife to get this additional allocation to prevent the wastage of her fruit as it ripens?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Through directive or order of the Secretary of Agriculture which will be applicable generally to all household users.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then it applies only to a class?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right, the whole class of consumers throughout the United States in the class of household users.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That will not aid the individual housewife.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I believe it will; she will get as much as anybody else. It will aid the gentleman's wife just as it will aid my wife.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then we have this problem, the stores right here in Washington are full of sugar but there are no stamps, there are no passwords or anything to enable consumers to get the sugar. That is true all over the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Stamps for additional amounts of sugar will be validated tomorrow.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. They must have anticipated this; is that right?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; they anticipated that there would be demand for the sugar. The fact that grocers, wholesale and retail, have adequate stocks of sugar on hand at the present time indicates that if we did not have this rationing at this time there would not be any sugar in the warehouses. Everybody would buy all the sugar as fast as they possibly could to the prejudice of the late comer. That is the reason for having it in the hands of grocers, so as to have a stock to meet the demand next week and the week following. You might just as well say that because the warehouses in Michigan are stocked today we should do away with rationing entirely; but we do not know what is going to happen 3 months from now. If we did not have rationing probably no housewife would have much sugar then.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. And the continuation of inventory controls does enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the sugar control, although, as the gentleman says, only as to wholesalers or dealers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The gentleman will remember that I offered an amendment on the floor to continue those controls only to nonhousehold users. It applies only to nonhousehold users. In conference we were very insistent that that provision stay in the bill. There was no trouble among the conferees in that respect.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then we can rest assured that we are not going to have a continuation of the New Deal control and planned economy in reference to sugar rationing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my hope.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Am I correct in assuming that inventory control after October 31 also means use control?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. BUCK. Then what is to prevent a person who has laid in a 60-day inventory from using it at a greatly accelerated rate, replacing his inventory the next day? I do not see how you can have effective control if you do not have use control along with the inventory control.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman mean would a commercial user be allowed to expand?

Mr. BUCK. Expand his consumption.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the Secretary of Agriculture probably would take an average over a period of time to determine what that man's current needs or that industry's current needs were, and if he had, we will say, 20 tons of sugar in his warehouse on the average and he was replenishing that and keeping 20 tons in there, perhaps a normal 30-day supply, the Secretary of Agriculture would say: "You can have no more than 20 tons or a 30-day supply." He would have to use it out of his incoming sugar.

Mr. BUCK. Then control after October 31 does involve consumption control? It must, to be effective.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of volume use; yes.

Mr. BUCK. Yes. Will the gentleman explain how the Department of Agriculture is going to police that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That has not been worked out. It is a question of administration. Frankly, I may say it is one of our purposes to get rid of the cumbersome administrative machinery we now have. The Government should be encouraged to simplify control, or the enforcement of sugar control; so I think that is a problem which might well be left to the Appropriations Committee, the question as to how much of a staff it will give the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce it.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am afraid the RECORD will show something I do not believe should be in this. Inventory control, as I understand this bill, does not prevent manufacturer A, for instance, from using 40 tons of sugar instead of 20 tons of sugar. Your rationing goes off on October 31. The Secretary cannot ration sugar subsequent to that date, but he can say, "You, Mr. Wholesaler B, can have on your floor no more than a 60-day supply of sugar at a time." You are in a free market so far as purchases are concerned. So when you reduce your inventory of sugar to a 30-day supply, if the rule is 60 days, you can go in the market and buy another 30-day supply of sugar, whether you are a manufacturer or a wholesaler. The point is, you must not have on your floor or in inventory sugar in excess of what the Secretary of Agriculture says you may have. Is that not the right interpretation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think in practice it is, but you have this additional protection: Every industrial and commercial user might expect when price control is off of sugar that there will be an immediate reaction in the prices. Prices may immediately go up; yet he knows also from experience that prices will very shortly afterward come back down perhaps below what they were before controls were taken off. So he is not going to stock unusually large inventories of sugar at high prices which he will have to sell for less than he paid for it. That controls very much these inventories and I do not think we need to worry too much about that. They have to go into the open market, and inasmuch as they cannot increase their inventories the only way they could use a disproportionate

amount of sugar would be to expand their production, which is probably now at capacity. So the two influences are against unusually large inventories. One, they will not have equipment to expand or to use so much sugar as to prejudice the needs of the householder; and second, it would not be very good business on their part to buy in a high-price market and sell in a few weeks in a low-price market.

Mr. BUCK. If a particular manufacturer doubled his output on November 1, then he would be permitted to have double the amount of inventory?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. It would be under regulation. He could not start to build up those inventories. It would be under control. He would have to build his inventories before the controls went off, and he could not do that under the rationing system.

Mr. BUCK. How often could he replace his inventory?

Mr. WOLCOTT. As often as it was necessary to maintain it at his average level, I presume. That would be under regulation also.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. When this bill was before the House we amended it to provide that nothing in it would be construed to violate any of the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, and I note the conference report has some wording different from that. Would the gentleman explain that to us and assure us that it is at least the equivalent of what we passed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We did not think when we wrote the language in here that authorized the transfer temporarily of these employees that there would be any question but that the word "temporarily" modified the length of service and not the status of the individual. The Civil Service Commission, however, gave an interpretation which indicated there was some doubt in their minds as to whether it went to the status of the individual or to his employment. To clarify the fact that we did not intend by this transfer to interfere in any manner with the Civil Service status of the employee transferred, we substituted the language at the top of page 7 for the language that we had in the House bill. This positively assures that the civil service status of the employee transferred will in no way be affected.

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

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The conference report guarantees each consumer 35 pounds of sugar for this year, as I understand. We are dealing now with the question of supply, because our sugar has been produced and is now being refined, and there will be very little more available from the 1947 production until after these controls go off, so we are dealing with the question of distributing the supply which we have on hand and which is now being refined in Cuba.

I think it should be pointed out that we secure approximately 40 percent of our sugar from Cuba to take care of the needs of the American people. The Cuban production will be approximately 1,500,000 tons greater for this crop year than it was for last year. Now, the committee report holds out some hope to the consumers of this Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman give that figure advisedly?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That figure of 1,500,000 is the Department's figure; that is the Cuban figure. Everybody in industry has said it would be more than that, so I will take the Department's estimate on that. But what I want to point out is this: I do not think we should hold out a false hope that the housewives, the consumers, will each get 50 pounds of sugar because as I see it it is entirely dependent on what the International Emergency Food Council does with the consent of our administration in distributing that extra sugar from Cuba to other countries of the world.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Excepting that the Emergency Food Council has already allocated the estimated increase of Cuban production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, that is 1,500,000 tons. In the last 30 days the Cubans estimate that they will have five or six hundred thousand tons more than the January estimate. Now, I say this: That the American people are entitled to that extra five or six hundred thousand tons from Cuba, which will give them at least 5 pounds more sugar, to make it 40 pounds instead of 35 pounds, and also give some more to industrial users. Our Food Committee has made that request to the Secretary of Agriculture—that he will give that extra 5 pounds to the American consumers, which will give us 40 pounds instead of 35 pounds.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish the gentleman's Food Study Committee would continue to stress the point which the gentleman has just made—that it is the intention of Congress that any increase in the Cuban crop production should be reflected in proportionate increases in the available supply of sugar in the United States to effectuate our purpose that the housewife will get up to 50 pounds of sugar.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We will do that, and we know we will have the help of the gentleman and other Members of Congress. But I want to point out that if the International Food Council, with the consent of the administration, decides to give that five or six hundred thousands tons to other countries of the world, then we will not get more than 35 pounds.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. There has been a good deal of talk about dates. It is regrettable that the bill is not in the form in which it was originally introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of our committee. There is no significance to the October 31 date except that that is the period when we hope the crop will be marketed and be ready for distribution, that is, it will be on the way. The impression is that the gentleman from Michigan introduced a bill which extended controls to March 31, 1948. That is a false impression. His bill provided that on October 31 of this year the controls should end unless the Secretary of Agriculture should make a finding that this commodity continued in short supply, which is quite a different provision from the categorical ending of controls on a given date.

The point I want to make, and I make this comment chiefly from the standpoint of improving our legislative craftsmanship, is that Congress ought not to leave this situation in that condition, and the country ought not to be under any false impressions as to the possibilities that may confront us on October 31. There was a rather hopeful picture of the sugar situation presented by Dr. Marshall, who apparently knows a great deal about the situation. He said if growing continues, if the weather is favorable, there will be perhaps one of the finest crops not only in Cuba but in all parts of the world, and to that extent we can have a rather optimistic view of the future; but because of the action not only of this body but of the other body we are now left exposed to that potential hazard.

May I say in commendation of the chairman's action in that respect that I hope Congress will legislate with greater skill on situations of this kind and not walk away from the condition hopefully asserting that the crop will be abundant. If it is not abundant, we are going to have a situation between October 31 and January 1, when Congress reconvenes, that cannot be remedied by any action by any authority that we have placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I simply wanted to say with reference to the chairman's action that I thought the pattern which he laid out in his original bill is one that we ought to follow. It would hold the power in the hands of Congress and not turn us over to the cold processes of economic law, which have a way of bringing disaster. Certainly we do not want a repetition in the sugar situation of the condition that we had after the other war, when prices skyrocketed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am very grateful to the gentleman for his very valuable contribution.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This measure carries with it the right to fix prices of sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The truth of the business is that sugar is being shipped from Cuba to other countries because it is higher in other countries in terms of our own money than it is in the United States. This measure is not going to cure anything. It reminds me of the fellow who wanted to fill up the empty barrel by pouring water in at the bunghole with both ends knocked out. Here we are in a monetary inflation. I call attention again to the fact that it is the duty of the Committee on Banking and Currency to do something about it.

This is not doing a thing in the world but perpetuating until October 31 a control that should have been taken off long ago. If we will take these controls entirely off, there will be enough sugar coming to the United States, and produced in the United States, to supply the entire demand. As long as you keep this price fixing on you are going to have the same condition and the same reaction from the American people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is in substantial accord with the majority thinking of the Committee on Banking and Currency, except, of course, that we do have export controls and we do allocate the world supply of sugar throughout the world under the International Emergency Food Council; so the statement which the gentleman made that the bulk of the sugar is moving to foreign countries because of better price, in view of the exchange conditions at the present time, probably is not warranted.

I think we are all looking toward the same end as the gentleman. That is surely in keeping with the principle which the gentleman announces. I know the committee will follow through because it is our impression that we should remove these controls just as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. RANKIN. I am informed that all the sugar that is produced in Cuba and other countries is to be shipped anywhere except the United States, as long as we hold this price down, while our currency is inflated, from less than $5,000,000,000 to almost $30,000,000,000. Unless we attempt to restrict inflation of the currency, we are going to keep the American people from getting the amount of sugar they need.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman might be misinformed. We buy the entire exportable Cuban sugar crop and accept an allocation under the agreement with the International Emergency Food Council.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I brought up a point during the previous debate on this bill regarding towns that have had an unusual increase in population. The situation with reference to that has been made much clearer by the wording of this bill. The responsibility for meeting that situation is squarely in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that situation will be somewhat helped.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. How soon will he be able to put this program as outlined in the present bill into effective operation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Theoretically, tonight at 12:01 a. m.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And all appeals should be made to him directly?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have one other situation in mind. Suppose a bakery is starting out in a rather large town, and there is no historic basis for the allocation of sugar; that is, a new bakery and there is no other bakery serving that community. That would come squarely within section 1 of this bill also?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is my impression that it would definitely come under that.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The Secretary of Agriculture has authority under section 1 to grant authority to a new bakery serving a community exclusively to furnish them sugar immediately?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He has very wide authority in that respect.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Just a moment ago the gentleman from Mississippi made some reference to the duty or obligation upon the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. I meant to say the Committee on Banking and Currency. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When I answered the gentleman from Mississippi I did so having in mind that he said the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. But I can assure the gentleman that the whole question of credit and controls will continue to have the attention of our committee.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Until the Congress of the United States takes back the power vested in it by the Constitution to coin money and regulate the value thereof, you are going to have this wild and unlimited inflation that we are suffering from now, and you are not going to cure anything by attempting to fix prices and control the supply.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The guaranty provisions as to quantity which have been written in the conference report provide 35 pounds and possibly up to 50 pounds for the housewives.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We guarantee 35 pounds for the housewife and then provide that any increase over the estimates will be allocated to her until she has received up to 50 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. Essentially that is my understanding of it. Even if that were not in the bill, the governmental authority having to do with the rationing and distribution of sugar would certainly not sanction hoarding sugar in storage, would they?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The House committee felt that the amount of available sugar should be made available as quickly as possible to the housewife. I think the hearings indicate she would get at least 35 pounds. As a matter of fact, I think we assured the House when the matter was under consideration that she would get 10 pounds more than last year. So the 35 pounds written in the Senate language made no additional guarantee. She would have gotten 35 pounds regardless of that action.

Mr. DINGELL. But if the volume of sugar produced was less than would permit distribution per capita in the amount of 35 pounds, the guarantee in itself would mean nothing, would it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We assure her that she is going to get 35 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. On the visible supply? It might be more on the estimated world supply of sugar.

Mr. WOLCOTT. To be practical and realistic about it, we are confident there will be enough sugar so without any guaranty in the law she would have gotten 35 pounds anyway, and we hope she can get up to 50 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. That is what I am trying to bring out, but that will depend on the present maturing crop—that is, the total volume, not alone in the United States and off-shore sugar-producing areas, but the world supply of sugar. That will be the deciding factor as to how much sugar the housewives will get and what the commercial user of sugar will get.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The available supply is getting better and better. The prospect of increases seems to be getting better.

Mr. DINGELL. Is the gentleman fully satisfied with the provisions having to do with the controls of sugar inventories?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Personally, I am reasonably well satisfied with the provisions in respect to inventory controls.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have received a great many letters from people saying there is a large amount of sugar in storage throughout the country—in the stores. I want to point out to the gentleman that before the end of this week more than a billion pounds of that sugar will pass from the warehouses and stores into the hands of consumers, with this new 10-pound ration stamp which will go on April 1.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has answered the question which was asked a while ago much better than I did, and has clarified the situation.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Congress were to refuse to adopt this conference report or pass this bill, as I understand it, the controls on sugar would go off now; is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Tonight at 12 o'clock.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I am for that.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman refer to page 6 of the conference report, the language with reference to the reduction from 50,000 to 25,000 tons? Is that 25,000 tons there referred to the same as the tonnage referred to in section 3 of subparagraph (b) on page 2?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where it is broken down into 12,500-ton lots?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. May I say to the gentleman the Senate had provided 50,000 tons for the full year, up to March 31st. The conferees cut it in half. It had been allocated on a quarterly basis, but extending it to October 31st the gentleman will see runs it over into the fourth quarter. So we had to divide it

there somewhere, and we divided it on June 30, 1947.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One additional question on that same 25,000 tons: Is it out of that reserve, 12,500 tons quarterly, that the Secretary is to have the possibility of meeting, for instance, a very heavy fruit production, say in California or western Michigan or some other heavy fruit-producing State? In other words, can he take from that 25,000 tons the necessary sugar to increase the commercial or industrial allotment in an area where there is a great fruit crop?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I have answered the question. It is my understanding that the sugar which should be made available for the classifications which the gentleman calls attention to is in addition to the minimum of 25,000 tons.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where would that language appear? That is what I should like to clear up.

Mr. WOLCOTT. To be frank with the gentleman, I do not know that it is so specific. That is my understanding, and I think the understanding of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO MAY 1, 1947

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I want to announce that the President of Mexico, His Excellency Miguel Aleman, will address a joint meeting of the Members of the Senate and House on Thursday, May 1, 1947, at 12:30 p. m.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time on Thursday, May 1, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by him on Government control of sources of information, which appears in the current issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include therein two letters.

GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. DONDERO. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, Constantine Brown, able and popular foreign analyst of the Washington Star, and his charming wife have been in Europe since last January. Mrs. Brown, the former Helen Lombard, is one of the best known women in Washington, herself a scribe of wide experience, brilliant author of a book entitled "Washington Waltz," a volume dealing with the diplomatic life of Washington, and of a recent book entitled "While They Fought," which depicts events behind the scenes in our Nation's Capital during 1941 to 1946. They are now visiting Turkey.

In yesterday's Star, Mr. Brown points out that the guerrilla bands which have been and are now harassing the feeble Government of Greece were organized in other Balkan countries. They are large and powerful. They are well equipped and well supplied with stores of all kinds, derived mainly from two sources, UNRRA and lend-lease from the United States. How did they get them?

Now we are asked to send more supplies to those countries to stop the march of communism. What assurance have we that such supplies will not also fall into the hands of these communistic guerrilla bands and be used against us to defeat the very purpose for which they are sent?

It is tragic indeed that while we appease and coddle Communists in the United States we are urged to send supplies to halt their progress in other parts of the world.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY: PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon notwithstanding that the House is in session.

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

There was no objection.

BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE IN FRANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 1621 to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boys Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to lend, at his discretion, to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for use at the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held in France, in the months of July and August 1947, the following: 225 canvas bags, 1,200 duffel bags, 2,900 wool blankets, 200 vinegar bottles, 200 sugar bowls, 1,200 canvas watering buckets, 205 tent oil-stove burners, 25 corrugated nesting galvanized cans (24 gallon), 210 corrugated nesting galvanized cans (32 gallon), 1,200 meat cans, 200 five-gallon water cans, 1,200 aluminum canteens, 225 flag cases, 1,300 folding chairs, 200 alarm clocks, 100 round insulated containers, 1,250 folding canvas cots, 1,200 canteen covers, 1,200 aluminum canteen cups, 10 empty field desks, 25 five-gallon gasoline drums, ten 55-gallon gasoline drums, 225 national standard flags, 225 wooden flagstaffs, 1,500 forks, 100 halazone tablets (bottles), 25 immersion type for can heaters, 1,500 knives, 225 gasoline lanterns, 1 stencil-duplicating machine, 2,850 pillowcases, 1,250 feather pillows, 500 sirup pitchers, 300 water pitchers, 200 mustard pots, 200 stock pots, 7 field ranges, 25 latrine screens, 10 field safes, 200 pepper shakers, 200 salt shakers, 160 cotton bed sheets, 1,500 spoons, 205 tent stoves, 10 folding camp tables, 120 mess tables, 3 assembly tents, and 200 squad tents: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of the said jamboree as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War before delivering said property shall take from the said Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is further authorized, at his discretion and without expense to the United States, to provide transportation from the United States and return, on a vessel of the Army Transport Service, to those Boy Scouts of America and Scouters certified by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, attending this jamboree. That the amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be deposited to the credit of such of the current appropriations for the support of the Army as bear such expenses, and shall be available for the same purposes as those appropriations.

SEC. 3. The taxes imposed by sections 3469 and 3475, or any comparable sections that may now or during 1947 be in effect, of the Internal Revenue Code, shall not apply to amounts paid for ocean transportation to the persons and property herein and above described attending this jamboree.

SEC. 4. That under such regulations as he may prescribe the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters of the Boy Scouts of America who are citizens of the United States or, if not citizens of the United States, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States upon certification by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as to their qualifications to attend this jamboree as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, without fee for the application of the issuance of said passports.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 9, after the word "tents", insert "and such other equipment as may be required by the Boy Scouts of America which is available from American stocks."

Page 4, line 23, strike out the word "of" and insert "for or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] introduced a similar bill.

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

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Clarksburg Telegram entitled "Congress Keeps a Promise."

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain statistics, tables, and a report.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence between himself and Mr. Clayton, also an article from the New York Times and an address made over the radio.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances, in each to include an article.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I would like to announce that today the committee issues its first report, a 56-page highly documented report entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

Mr. Speaker, the facts contained in this pamphlet are the result of intensive study of several experts which, in one case, has extended over a period of 30 years of Communist activities and observations both in and out of the Communist Party.

The entire tenor of the contents of this report can be gained in the first four sentences, which I would like to read:

The Communist movement of the United States may be properly characterized as—

1. An organization operating under centralized discipline subordinated to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the single and ruling party of that country.

2. A section of a World Communist Party, controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

3. An organization whose basic aim, whether open or concealed is the abolition of our present economic system and democratic form of government and the establishment of a Soviet dictatorship in its place.

4. An organization resorting to deception, evasion, illegal methods, violence, and civil war, methods implicit in its revolutionary purpose.

All Members will receive a copy of this report, and I highly recommend that every Member of Congress read it.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. COLE of Kansas. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, like an old family skeleton in the closet, our huge Government debt is rattling its billions of bones. We prefer to ignore it in favor of more thrilling discussions of tax and budget reductions.

But most important to our economy is a careful and exacting study of the management of this debt.

In addition to my speech of last Wednesday, therefore, I shall, from time to time, report to the House the results of some inquiries I am conducting. I hope, in this manner, to create an interest in this subject.

From President Truman on down, the administration advises us that the important thing about our $260,000,000,000 debt is the annual interest charge. The debt itself can be paid whenever we get around to it; meanwhile, we can well afford to pay an interest charge of "only" $5,000,000,000.

But why five billion? Why, indeed?

When the war ended on September 2, 1945, this Nation owed virtually the same amount of debt it owes today. But it paid only $4,500,000,000 a year for interest on this debt. And it would pay only $4,500,000,000 today for annual interest charges if the administration had not, through the wholly unnecessary Victory loan and subsequent pay-offs, managed to substitute twenty billions in long-term high-interest securities for short-term seven-eighths percent and 1½ percent securities on hand when the war ended.

Nor is this the end.

In a study of Full Employment Patterns, 1950, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor assumes—see page 12—that—

No reduction in the size of the debt will be attempted during 1950.

Granting this assumption, it goes on to estimate—see page 13—that the interest charge on the debt will not be $4,500,000,000 nor even $5,000,000,000, but $5,600,000,000.

It would appear that the administration, far from anticipating an actual net reduction of the debt, is bending every effort to see how high an interest charge we can afford to pay. Within 5 years after World War II it will have increased this annual charge by more than $1,000,000,000—and this wholly unwarranted increase will equal the entire prewar cost of the debt, $1,100,000,000 of interest.

CATTLE IN NEBRASKA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I point with some pride to the recent figures released by the Department of Commerce from the 1945 census which revealed that Cherry County, Nebr., in the Fourth Congressional District led all the 3,069 counties in the United States in cattle on farms. Six other counties in the Fourth District were among the first 100 counties. It will be interesting to my friends from the eastern part of our great country to know that Cherry County has an area of 5,982 square miles or 25 square miles larger than the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island together. Six counties in the Fourth Nebraska District are larger in area than the State of Connecticut.

The seven leading counties in the Fourth Nebraska District with their national rating, and their January 1, 1945 cattle and calves inventories follow:

County	Ranking	Cattle
Cherry	1	237,888
Custer	12	141,159
Holt	13	140,199
Lincoln	17	124,394
Sheridan	31	99,625
Garden	36	95,753
Dawson	82	76,460

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I delivered before the Agricultural Limestone Division of Pennsylvania last Monday at Harrisburg. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that this will exceed the authorized limit, but notwithstanding that fact I ask that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARRY L. HAINES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to report the death of a former Member of this House, my predecessor, who served here with you for 10 years, the Honorable Harry L. Haines, of Red Lion. At that time it was the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania. While I differed very seriously with Mr. Haines on a great many important national issues, my respect for him as a citizen was not affected by it. Mr. Haines was elected and served here for 10 years, and always carried the esteem of his friends who knew him best and lived closest to him. Whatever they said or did not say of Mr. Haines, there was one thing you had to say about him: He was always a gentleman. He enjoyed a strong, Christian faith. He was a leader in his church and Sunday school. His town was known as the best attended Sunday school town of any city of the United States. He was one of the men who was responsible for that.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I served with Harry Haines for 10 years. I was closely associated with him. I regarded him as one man who measured up to Thomas Jefferson's standard who, when asked what were the essential questions to be asked of an applicant for office, replied, "Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful?" I never met a finer, more conscientious public servant in this House or elsewhere than Harry Haines, of Pennsylvania.

He was a statesman without duplicity, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would like to pay this tribute to Harry Haines as a colleague whom I served with in the House of Representatives. He was one of the finest men I ever knew. Mr. Haines came from Pennsylvania. He was honorable and conscientious. I do not think that I had a better friend in the Congress at any time, nor did I ever consider any Member of Congress a better friend of mine than was Harry Haines. I always admired him because he was straightforward and honest, and it was a great pleasure to serve with him. I am sure the people of his own county and State have lost a great citizen—one who shall always be remembered as a real gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

His town of Red Lion was known as the cigar center of the United States for many years. They made 7 percent of the cigars of the country there at one time. He was one of the pioneers of that industry. During the First World War he was chairman of the American Red Cross in his county. He was chairman of the Lion's Club and governor of the State organization. He was a director of the Keystone Automobile Club of the county, as well as the Boy Scouts of America. He was also on the committee of York County Manufacturers' Association and the National League of Masonic Clubs.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I doubt if I can add anything to the splendid tributes that have been paid to the memory of Harry Haines. I knew him all the years he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I remember him, and I always shall, as an earnest, honest, able servant of the people, and to those he leaves behind I would like to say that they have my deepest and heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Harry Haines was born and reared in the comunity in which he died. He was one of the leaders in everything that was for the benefit of that community during those years. The community mourns the loss of an outstanding citizen. I am happy to say that he leaves five sons and daughters who will carry on and who are a credit to the community. He furthermore leaves, I believe, eight grandchildren and one great-grandchild. I much regret to see the passing of this good citizen and extend to his bereaved family my deep sympathy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the death of Harry Haines must have saddened the hearts of everyone whose privilege it was to come in contact with him during a full life. It was my privilege to serve with Mr. Haines for 8 years in this body. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that there was never a more sincere and hard-working public servant in this body during this period than Harry Haines.

Mr. Haines was a deeply religious man. I remember back during the dark days of the early thirties how disturbed he was at the move of our great Republic toward things that perhaps were foreign to his fundamental beliefs. Mr. Haines found comfort in the realization that all the steps taken during that period were taken from an emergency standpoint and for the purpose of trying to get us back on an even keel.

Mr. Haines has made a great contribution to the welfare of the entire Nation. I know his community and his fine family must indeed be very sad today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radiogram to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject House Tax Bill Lightens "Little's Fellow's" Burden, and include certain tables.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the Moscow Conference.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Mr. MASON. 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. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our Assistant Secretary of State, Will Clayton, with about 100 experts, counselors, and advisers, leaves next week for Geneva to sit down at an international economic poker game that will last for some 3 months. Judging by the performances of our State Department in the past at international poker games, Uncle Sam will come home from this poker game without his economic shirt. I am going to speak on this matter next Monday, and at that time I expect to ask questions of this House and of the Nation that I was prevented from asking Will Clayton on Saturday by a point of order being made in the Committee on Ways and Means.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. WOLVERTON. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the House and, particularly, those Members who have expressed interest in the matter, that I am today, as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and at the direction of the committee, introducing a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an inquiry and complete study of the policies and procedures of the Federal Communications Commission.

The original act was approved June 19, 1934. It is the opinion of many that it is appropriate, after this lapse of nearly 13 years, to reexamine the whole subject and ascertain whether and to what extent the original intent of Congress is being administered. There has come to the committee considerable complaint as to some of the policies now in effect and the procedures for administering the act.

The inquiry is not intended as a witch hunt, or for any purpose other than to make certain that present laws and administration are making available to the people of the United States the full use of radio communication upon the terms and conditions that best serve the public. Already a start has been made in this important matter by conferences between the committee and the Commission. The purpose of the resolution I am introducing is to widen the scope and make more effective the course which the committee has inaugurated and desires to pursue.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I understand it will be in excess of the amount allowed, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

RESULTS OF POLL ON NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. McGREGOR. 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. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting copy of the questionnaire which in March 1947 I attempted to place

in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. It was humanly impossible to send such a questionnaire to each citizen of my district, but I believe the replies received fully cover the opinions of the majority of the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District, which it is my honor to represent.

My district might well be considered the Main Street of our Nation. We have approximately 50 percent urban and 50 percent rural populations; all labor and farm organizations represented; as well as large industries and small business; two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to each committeeman and committeewoman, both Democratic and Republican, labor groups, farm groups, attorneys, barbers, business and industry, housewives, newspapers, professional groups—doctors and dentists, and so forth—public office holders, salesmen, and school teachers. A total of 2,500 questionnaires was sent and the number of returns received—1,260—proves to me that the people are anxious to express their views on issues before the Congress for consideration.

I hope that each Member of Congress will carefully study the opinions as expressed by the people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio.

WHY IS THE NAVY WITHHOLDING INFORMATION FROM CONGRESS?

Mr. POULSON. 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. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a member of the Public Lands Committee and at the request of the chairman of that committee, I recently inspected two of the non-self-governing possessions of the United States in the company of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, and two of my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Hawaii, Delegate FARRINGTON.

On that trip, I learned many things about the hundreds of square miles of public lands of the United States in the far Pacific, about their local inhabitants, and about their government.

The Secretary of the Navy pursuant to Executive orders of the President is charged with the responsibility of administering the civil affairs of the people of Guam and Samoa. In his capacity as governor of an island population of American nationals it is his responsibility to keep the President and Congress informed of the wishes of the people he governs and to protect to the fullest the civil liberties and basic freedoms of these non-self-governing peoples. Among the rights of all Americans is the right to petition the Congress of the United States.

In Guam, which is ruled by a United States naval governor under the supervision of, and directly responsible to, the Secretary of the Navy, James F. Forrestal, I was told by certain of the people of the island—not by the naval governor—that they had petitioned the Congress of the United States for full citizenship and the enactment of an organic act for the government of their island.

Gentlemen, I have in my possession a copy of that petition, Joint Resolution 1, of the Eighth Guam Congress, which was unanimously adopted by that body of elected representatives of the people of Guam on January 4, 1947, and forwarded to the United States naval governor of Guam for forwarding, through channels of naval authority, to the Eightieth Congress of the United States. That petition has not to my knowledge been presented to this Congress to this date. Knowledge of that petition has been deliberately withheld from the Congress by the Navy Department—James F. Forrestal, presiding.

In American Samoa, the United States naval governor, who is also under the supervision of and directly responsible to Mr. Forrestal, told our party that the local inhabitants of American Samoa had not requested a change in their form of government. Gentlemen, at this moment, I have in my possession a true copy of an enactment of the 1945 General Fono of all the leading chiefs of American Samoa in which they proposed to the Congress of the United States a form of organic act for government of American Samoa.

Gentlemen, that request—that petition—from the duly elected chiefs of 16,000 loyal Americans has not to my knowledge been presented to this Congress to this date. Nor has the Congress been informed by Mr. Forrestal of the wishes of the people for local self-government. Knowledge of that request has also been deliberately withheld from the Congress of the United States by the Navy Department, James F. Forrestal, presiding.

Why have not these petitions been transmitted to Congress? They have been presented to the naval governors who are directly responsible to Mr. Forrestal and yet have never been transmitted to the Congress.

Mr. Forrestal, pursuant to Executive orders of the President, is responsible for the 40,000 civilians, including many resident Americans on Guam and Samoa.

The civil liberties and basic freedoms of these Americans should be as important to the administration as is the democracy of the Greeks and the Turks. I concur in the belief that the Reds must be eliminated from our Government but while the present administration is hunting Reds in its efforts to preserve democracy, it is stifling democracy in our own non-self-governing Territories by deliberately denying these people access to the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JONES of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Deputy Administrator C. H. Nance, of the Veterans' Administration, Bedford Hospital, Addition for Women Patients at Bedford, Mass., and a statement by Dr. Burrier, administrator of the hospital.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make on the First Deficiency Appropriations bill in committee and to include certain statutory provisions and tables and excerpts from committee hearings.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon.

THE HAND OF ESAU AND THE VOICE OF JOHNSTON

Mr. RANKIN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Eric Johnston, a representative of the motion-picture industry, came before the Committee on Un-American Activities and read a lengthy statement, which has been referred to as "The Hand of Esau and the Voice of Johnston."

If Mr. Johnston does not know of the Communist infiltration into Hollywood, he should study the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities as well as the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

We have definite information that for years the script writers and movie actors in Hollywood contributed as much as $3,000 a week to the Communist Party—a subversive organization which is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

Large numbers of moving pictures that come out of Hollywood carry the Communist line.

We are called upon to challenge the spread of communism throughout the world because of its threat to the civilization of mankind. Yet we have them in Hollywood spreading their poisonous propaganda through the moving pictures. We have them on the radio sending their poisonous propaganda into every home. We have them in our educational institutions putting in extra time poisoning the minds of the youth of the land who are being educated at public expense.

If we are going to challenge the spread of communism throughout the world, let us begin at home and put a stop to the use of our public institutions and our public methods of communication by this dangerous element—these enemies within our gates.

As I told Mr. Johnston, unless the people in control of the moving-picture industry are willing to clean house and fumigate, then Congress will have to do it for them.

We are not going to permit American civilization to be destroyed in this way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances; in one to include an editorial from today's Washing-

ton Times-Herald on the housing situation; in the second instance to include an editorial from the New York Times of today on Edgar L. Warren and the Conciliation Service, as well as a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star; in the third instance to include a newspaper article by Sidney Fields, from the Daily Mirror, and an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 26; and in the fourth instance to include a newspaper article in today's Washington Daily News by Thomas L. Stokes.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement issued jointly by the governors of six New England States in support of the Truman policy.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Centralia Illinois mine disaster and include three editorials.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each case to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Rochester Diocesan Holy Name Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lowell Sun.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 10, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Pulitzer.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move 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. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue for 3 hours, the time to be controlled by and equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that mean the entire day will be devoted to general debate on this bill?

Mr. TABER. I would hardly expect the entire day would be devoted to that, because, as I understand, there is a conference report expected from the Senate on the War Powers Act, and I understand it will be the purpose of the leadership to have that disposed of. Perhaps we may even rise during the progress of the debate in order to do that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement about the conference report. It is absolutely necessary that this conference report be agreed to before midnight. Therefore, the Chair would like the Committee to rise when that conference report comes from the Senate so that it may be acted upon immediately instead of waiting until late in the evening.

Mr. CANNON. Then it is possible that general debate may extend into tomorrow?

Mr. TABER. It might a little, but I think that I should say for the benefit of the membership that it will not be my purpose to try to read the bill tonight.

Mr. CANNON. The bill, then, positively will not be read today?

Mr. TABER. That will be my understanding.

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

There was no objection.

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. 2849, first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have here a deficiency bill involving $2,471,000,000. The estimates have been reduced below the budget by $628,000,000. I am going to spend a little time at this point in describing what items are in this bill and discussing in a general way without too much detail what is included in the bill. I shall not cover the minor items, simply the major ones. The report goes into the full question in detail.

A good many of the items covered by this bill are for pay increases that have been allowed, and other items are for things that have come up as a result of contingencies that could not be foreseen. Some of them are for such things as new activities that have been created.

There is here a grant to States of $135,000,000 for old-age assistance; $9,064,000 for grants to states to administer the Unemployment Insurance Compensation Act; $2,780,000 for the Public Buildings Administration.

The bill contains provision to meet some damage claims.

There is included $1,881,000 for the new obligations of the Railroad Retirement Act resulting from the situation that was presented by the Crosser bill last summer.

There is $1,451,000,000 to take care of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but I am not going into any detail on this item until I get a little further along. I am simply going down through the items hurriedly to give an over-all picture.

There are a number of items for the District of Columbia totaling $4,035,000. The chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, by the way, persuaded us to add $665 on one item above the budget.

There is a small item for the government of St. Croix and the Virgin Islands. There is over-all $20,000,000 for the Post Office Department, $20,000,000, which was covered by a budget estimate for crop insurance, $465,000,000 for pay of the Army, and $300,000,000 for relief in occupied areas which goes to the Army. There is also an item of about $278,000,000 for pay of the Navy. That is represented by transfers

The Veterans' Administration item represents a cut of $200,000,000 on account of Army pensions. Taking the figures that General Bradley presented to us and upon his own testimony and concessions, we were able to cut that figure $200,000,000. The estimate had been made up some time before, and I do not believe they had taken into consideration certain facts which had arisen in the trend of those items. There is a very liberal figure in there, and that is conceded.

There is a cut of a million dollars for printing and binding, but that is small and is based entirely on what seemed to be their needs. There is no cut in the hospital service or the administrative service, although General Bradley has recognized that the number of employees has gone up too fast and he has told us he intends to reduce the number of civilian employees outside of the hospital picture by about 5,000 by the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What accounts for most of the reduction in that appropriation?

Mr. TABER. They are all based on ordinary mathematics, taking the public expenditures for the months to come and multiplying them by the number of months yet to go in the appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I was not concerned so much with the method employed in making the reduction but as to what services the reductions were taken from?

Mr. TABER. Well, the estimates that we found with more money than they actually need.

The first one was the item for pensions, and we found that they are agreeing to General Bradley's own statement, allowing a very considerable margin to go by. They had $200,000,000 more in the estimate than they could possibly use in the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does this figure represent the figure submitted by General Bradley, or did he concur in this reduction?

Mr. TABER. After he had been examined for awhile and we analyzed the figures, he admitted that we could make this cut.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And can this cut be made and keep up the vital services of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. TABER. This cut relates only to one item in the service. The item for administration of hospitals and the item for the Veterans' Administration itself was not cut, although frankly I felt that on the basis of the expenditures that had been made and that were in sight, there probably was $25,000,000 margin in the picture.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Do I understand correctly that the total reduction in the appropriations under the deficiency bill is $628,139,491?

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Out of that amount the total reduction in the Veterans' Administration is $551,020,000?

Mr. TABER. That is right, but the reduction in the Veterans' Administration was based on what the needs of the Administration would be without attempting in any way to curtail the emoluments or the pensions or the educational facilities or the unemployment insurance that the veterans are entitled to.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In other words, they are on estimates committed on pensions and readjustment benefits. Possibly later on they will have to be made up anyway, will they not?

Mr. TABER. If there is a shortage they will have to be made up, but I would not think there would be a shortage, because we have been very liberal in our figures.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. But we are committed under the law to meet these benefits.

Mr. TABER. Oh, that would be an obligation of the Government and we would have to pay them, but it would not behoove us to appropriate more funds than the progress of operations under the Veterans' Administration indicated would be required. It is all right to allow a reasonable margin, but it would not be proper for us to provide a large amount in addition to what the requirements would probably be, and that is the type of consideration that this appropriation bill has had.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did I understand the gentleman to say that we have a $25,000,000 margin?

Mr. TABER. In my own opinion they have a $25,000,000 margin over what we can figure their possible requirements. In the first item, that is, the item for salaries and expenses and the pension item, I figure they have just about a $20,000,000 margin which I would regard as sufficient, because that is quite a stabilized item which can be figured much more closely than this rehabilitation picture that follows a little later on. I have forgotten whether it is the next item or not.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is as to those pensions that have already been established, is it not?

Mr. TABER. No; it is for the pensions that have already been established and which may be established and allowed in the period between now and the 30th of June. You see, we are not attempting in this bill to go beyond the 30th of June in our operations, because the regular bill for the Veterans' Administration will come in, maybe the 1st of May or about that time and will be taken up at that time, to provide funds for the next fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I started to say something about the crop-insurance item of $20,000,000. The budget estimate came up for that, and it has been included. The reason it was included is this: Claims have been allowed which they had no funds to meet of over $20,000,000. There is no question but that there is an obligation on the part of the Government to meet that $20,000,000 of claims. It was generally felt that as long as we had to take it and the Government owed the money we might just as well do it now. In my opinion, the whole operation has been very unfortunate. It shows a terrific loss from the beginning. I do not believe that if it were loaded with premiums sufficient to make it balance, anybody would take the insurance. I think it has been one of those things which the Government could get rid of.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am glad the gentleman brought up the question of crop insurance. I have tried to make a study of it since 2 years ago, when we were asked for $40,000,000 additional capital. This will make $90,000,000 of capital all told paid in for this crop insurance, besides the $37,000,000 of expense money they have had, besides making $8,000,000 on wheat, and besides all the premiums that were paid in. They have lost practically everything. That does not finish up the job of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I think it is one of the worst-managed pieces of business the Government ever got into. It never will be anything but a continuous loss if we keep it up.

Mr. TABER. I am very much inclined to believe the gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. PEDEN. Is it the gentleman's statement that he is against crop insurance as a policy?

Mr. TABER. I am. I do not think it can be done successfully, and I think that has been pretty well demonstrated.

Mr. PEDEN. If we could say that crop insurance has been poorly managed, which perhaps in some instances has made it operate at a loss, would the gentleman still say that if management could be had that would provide it in an equitable and just manner, as a principle, crop insurance is a good thing?

Mr. TABER. I doubt if it is a practical thing. My own judgment after quite careful study is that it is not a practical proposition nor one that can ever work out.

We have had certain items up with reference to the Army and Navy pay. Those items have been computed by members of the committee, some on one side of the aisle and some on the other, and are reductions that have been made. These items have been based on what the thing figured out to on the basis of the number of men they have had and the number they expect to have the rest of this fiscal year.

We are carrying here an item of $300,000,000 for relief in occupied areas for the Army. This means in Germany, Japan, Korea, and Austria. There we have this situation. There is a saving in sight in the Korean and Japanese end of the picture of approximately $56,000,000, and if we are going to get Germany in a position where she can very largely take care of her own food problem, another $28,000,000. For that reason, we felt it was wise to carry the whole $300,000,000 estimate so that there might be enough in the pipe lines to take care of our picture down through the first of October and through the crop year. Later on, as the regular committee gets to meet that problem, they will be able to take these figures into consideration. There are many distressing problems over there. Some of them are natural and some artificial. For instance, under the restrictions of the Potsdam Agreement it is impossible for the Germans to catch more than 100,000 tons of fish whereas their prewar catch was 700,000 tons. We are making up the deficiency. I do not know whether that is the right thing to do or not, but it does not seem so to me.

Those restrictions should be loosened up so that Germany can catch the fish that she needs and not be dependent entirely on charity.

There were many distressing things that came to our attention during the hearings upon that particular subject.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the powers that be in these foreign countries that we are looking after and for which we are supposed to be the guardian angels would permit them to do their own work so that they could earn some of their own living and would not have to expect the United States to buy the things that are necessary for them to sustain life, how much lighter would be the burden on our taxpayers. I think the gentleman from New York is absolutely right. Those in authority should permit them to earn their own living rather than expect us to support them and keep them.

Mr. TABER. At the present time, according to the testimony we had, UNRRA was getting ready to send $50,000,000 of stuff to Yugoslavia, $50,000,000 to Poland, $22,000,000 to the Ukraine, $11,000,000 to White Russia, and $20,000,000 to Russian occupied zones in Austria. I suppose the UNRRA is an international organization,

but most of the food and most of the money comes from us. Export licenses are required for every single item that is put out.

Frankly, it has seemed to me that before we grant export licenses for that sort of thing we should say to Mr. Stalin and say it plainly that we expect free elections to be held in Poland and that we expect free elections to be held in Yugoslavia; we expect Russia to abide by the agreements that she made to avoid propaganda here in the United States; that we expect her to quit inciting border hostilities along the northern part of Greece before we contribute any more of our food or our supplies to the Russian-controlled territories. I do not make this as a criticism of the State Department but as a suggestion of a way that would seem to me to lead toward the peace of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman rather answer the questions that I have regarding the so-called cuts in the Veterans' Administration or have the gentleman from Massachusetts answer them?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be here in a few minutes and I know he will be glad to answer them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman prefer that he answer them?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there was a reduction of $1,000,000 for printing and binding. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That probably could be justified, could it?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I think so, according to the past expenditure, so far.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is only a deficiency bill, anyway.

Mr. TABER. That is all, to carry them through to the end of the year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Apparently there was a cut of $200,000,000 in pensions. Of course, even if you cut pensions today, those payments are authorized by law and you would have to put it in the 1948 appropriation bill if you took it out of the deficiency bill. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TABER. Oh, we would have to pay it if there was a deficiency, but there will be no deficiency, and General Bradley himself admitted that in the hearings.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On the readjustment benefits, I understand there is a cut of $350,000,000. That is also true of that item, is it not? That is authorized by law and the Congress, of course, would have to pay those benefits.

Mr. TABER. The Congress would have to pay them, but on the other hand we figured to allow them a $170,000,000 margin in that connection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On the Federal Court claims, my understanding is a $20,000 cut is provided for in some other way. Is that true?

Mr. TABER. All those tort claims in all departments, we have decided should be treated alike and that they should be paid out of existing funds, rather than to set up a fund in advance for the departments to handle. They have not got to the point where they have any. They do not know what it will be or anything about it. That is an item that is a matter of management all the way through the whole Government, rather than the policy as to the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So that is really not a cut?

Mr. TABER. It is wiped out because we felt that handing them a bloc of money for something they did not know anything about and had no past experience with, was not good business, and we felt that way with every department.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I come to another matter that does trouble me very much. Apparently you call for the release of a hundred people in the Public Relations Division.

Mr. TABER. Yes. That is probably one of the things that is making more trouble for the Veterans' Administration than anything else. They have built up their force from 8 to 284. We felt that that Propaganda Division should be reduced; that that was one case where a very major mistake had been made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that if the money is not available for these people they will be dismissed without any way of getting their terminal leave or other money that is due them?

Mr. TABER. I do not understand that at all, and I do not think anyone else believes that would result.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman have hearings on the work of the Public Relations Division of the Bureau?

Mr. TABER. Yes; we did.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Does the gentleman think there might be any danger in the reduction of these estimates for benefits and pensions of veterans that might influence the Veterans' Administration to be tighter in their rulings or freeze up in their consideration of the continuation of benefits?

Mr. TABER. Not in the slightest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three other items I would like to cover very briefly. If you will turn in the report to "Judgments and authorized claims," there are three that involves $2,158.01 for three people named Watson, Lovett, and Dodd. These people were on the pay roll of the United States Government, two of them in the Federal Communications Commission and one of them in the Virgin Islands. It appeared from testimony that was presented to committees at the time, after very careful hearings, that these people did not owe their first loyalty to the United States. The Congress, by an overwhelming vote, refused to provide any funds for the payment of their salaries.

To my mind, these judgments have such an odor that I could not possibly conscientiously bring in here a bill to appropriate funds to pay them. They have been left out.

I think that is all I have to say at this time.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, 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. 2849), first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of a former colleague of ours from New York, Mr. Fish.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees 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. 931) entitled "An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. DONNELL and Mr. MAGNUSON as additional conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the foregoing bill.

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 amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) entitled "joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF TITLE III OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement as as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act shall be cited as the 'First Decontrol Act of 1947'.

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declared that it is vital to a free economy and full production in the United States that all emergency controls and war powers under the Second War Powers Act be removed except in certain limited instances.

"The Congress further declares that in each such limited instance the authority for such emergency controls and war powers should not be exercised by the grant of broad, general war powers but should be granted by restrictive, specific legislation.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of liquidating existing emergency controls and war powers and for the purpose of affording further opportunity for the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider specific legislation granting restricted authority in limited instances, title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, approved March 27, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1501. Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the 80th Congress on or before the date this section as amended takes effect, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this Act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947, except that such title III, and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the following purposes: (a) Allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony and streptomycin; (b) allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors; (c) allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers; (d) allocations of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; (e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments: *Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III: *Provided further*, That the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power of allocation under such title: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby (except subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1940, as amended by the Act of May 31, 1941) shall be in full force and effect as though this Act had not been enacted.'"

And the House agree to the same.

EARL C. MICHENER,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
EDWARD J. DEVITT,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment to the bill strikes out all the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

The first section of the bill as agreed to in conference is the same as the first section of the bill as it passed the Senate. It provides that the act shall be cited as the "First Decontrol Act of 1947."

Section 2 of the Senate bill contained a declaration of policy and in section 3 of the Senate bill was a statement that the provisions of the bill were for the purpose of liquidating existing emergency controls and war powers and of affording opportunity for the appropriate committees of Congress to consider specific legislation with respect to limited instances. Section 2 of the bill as agreed to in conference contains the same declaration of policy as section 2 of the Senate bill, and the statement in section 3 of the Senate bill, as to the purpose of the legislation, is contained in section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference as a statement of the purpose for which the amendment to section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act is made.

Section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference proposes to amend title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, in the same manner as proposed by the House amendment, except as follows:

(1) The following new language is added at the beginning of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942: "Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress on or before the date of this section as amended takes effect."

This language was added in order not to repeal House Joint Resolution 118 (80th Cong., 1st sess., entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry") or House Joint Resolution 146 (80th Cong., 1st sess., entitled "Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribuion and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes"), in the event that either or both of such joint resolutions become law before the enactment into law of the conference substitute.

(2) The language contained in the House amendment with respect to building materials and facilities is deleted. Allocation and priority authority with respect to materials and facilities suitable for the construction and/or completion of housing accommodations in rural and urban areas, and for the construction and repair of essential farm buildings, is contained in section 4 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946. This act expires December 31, 1947.

(3) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made by such title, would have remained in force for the purposes stated in the amendment until December 31, 1947. Under the conference substitute such title and amendment will remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the purposes stated in the conference substitute.

(4) Under the conference substitute, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the purpose of allocations of manila (abaca) fiber and cordage and agave fiber and cordage.

(5) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, would have remained in force for the following purpose:

"(b) allocations limited to control of production for export of automobiles and tractors;"

The language in the conference substitute omits the words "automobiles and".

(6) The House amendment provided that title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, shall remain in force for the following purpose:

"(c) allocating the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers;"

The conference substitute uses the words "allocations of" instead of the word "allocating".

(7) The House amendment used the words "allocations of materials or equipment" in two instances. In order to use language more consistent with the language contained in the law amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, the conference substitute uses the words "allocations of materials or facilities".

(8) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, and the amendment made by such title, remain in force for the following purpose:

"(e) allocations of materials or equipment for export which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments."

The language in the conference substitute omits the words "for export" and changes the word "equipment" to the word "facilities".

(9) The conference substitute contains the following proviso that was not contained in the House amendment: "*Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III."

Such proviso is applicable to all materials and facilities referred to in clauses (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

(10) The House amendment to section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act contained the following: "*Provided*, That the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any such title."

The conference substitute provides that the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power of allocation under such title.

(11) The conference substitute contains the following new proviso: "*Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof."

This proviso was added to make it clear that whatever authority there may be to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives of either, is to be derived from House Joint Resolutions 146 and 118, if enacted into law, and not from the pending bill (S. 931). If House Joint Resolution 146 does not become law and no other statute is enacted there will be no authority under section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, as amended by the conference substitute, to allocate sugar or its derivatives. If House Joint Resolution 118 does not become law and no other statute is enacted there will be no authority under the Second War Powers Act, as amended by the conference substitute, to allocate rubber or its derivatives.

(12) The last sentence of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as proposed to be amended by the House amendment was as follows: "After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted."

In order to avoid having the allocation and priorities power revived as it existed before the enactment of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, the conference substitute excepts from this provision the law amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942.

EARL C. MICHENER,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
EDWARD J. DEVITT,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate report on H. R. 931, which is Report No. 74, and the House report on H. R. 1983, which is House Report No. 192, plus the conference report just read, explains the whole situation. This is an unanimous agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the 1 hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this matter in the House, for explanation, the hour to be yielded by the gentleman as he sees fit.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which is now before the House explains very fully the action taken by the conferees on this particular piece of legislation. The only variance between the House version and the version reported by the conferees is very meager. I will attempt to explain the variances at this time so the Members will become familiar with them.

The particular act which is before the committee was called, as you will remember, the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended. This has been changed and it is now denominated the First Decontrol Act of 1947. That came from the Senate bill and was agreed to by the conferees.

Section 2 of the conference report is added, and that comes from the original Senate bill, S. 931, which I think is entirely apropos at this particular time with respect to this particular piece of legislation.

Title XV, which relates to section 1501 of the act, is the one with which we are dealing, because it deals with the question of extension of time. Always remember that tonight at midnight the Second War Powers Act expires by reason of the limitation of time. It was found upon the hearings before the subcommittee in the House and it was also so determined by the conferees that there were certain items which it was necessary that they be extended beyond this particular date. You will note in the conference report that titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of the Second War Powers Act are entirely eliminated, with the exception of certain items under title III which are extended. May I say that after the conferees had worked upon this report for quite a period of time it was finally unanimously agreed that the date for the final expiration of this particular act should be on June 30, 1947. You will recall that under the act in the form as it passed in the House certain items were extended until the 31st day of December 1947, but that date was eliminated, and each and every item which is contained in this bill, for extension, will expire on June 30, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman and the committee should be congratulated upon shortening that time. Is there any danger that it may be extended later as to any of these items?

Mr. SPRINGER. Not unless the House should vote to that effect. May I say that under section 2, which was written into the bill, this provision may be found:

The Congress further declares that in each such limited instance the authority for such emergency controls and war powers should not be exercised by the grant of broad, general war powers but should be granted by restrictive, specific legislation.

That is the attitude of the conferees with respect to that particular subject.

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

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman explain subsection (e) which appears on page 4 under section (3) of the conference report.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I state to my good friend that I will reach that point in just a few moments, if the gentleman will wait.

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

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to one of the exceptions found on page 2 which provides, among other things, items that are still to be under control, if I understand it correctly, such as allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that I will reach that point in just a few moments. I have one or two other matters I desire to explain before I reach that point.

Mr. RIZLEY. Very well. I would like to be heard on that point.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman. You will be given ample opportunity to be heard.

Under subsection (a) those things which are positively and definitely continued under this conference report relate to allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony, and streptomycin.

Under the evidence which was submitted to both the subcommittee in the House and the subcommittee in the Senate, it was shown without question of doubt that those particular items were critical and that there would be need and a necessity for an extension of the power for allocation of those items beyond this particular date, March 31. Therefore, those are extended with the others to which an extension was granted until June 30, 1947.

Under (b), allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors, there has been some question about tractors as far as the people in the United States are concerned. Therefore, for their protection allocations are continued until June 30, so instead of sending out of this country tractors which are definitely needed in this country, that power of allocation is extended until the 30th day of June 1947 for the benefit of our own people. The words "automobiles and" were deleted. Any allocation of those are unnecessary under all evidence adduced.

Now, coming to section (c), allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carrier, I am quite certain that everyone is quite familiar with that particular feature because it relates to allocations of boxcars, freight cars, in fact, any kind of cars for the purpose of transportation. All realize that in some particular sections there has been a shortage of those transportation facilities. The power of allocation of those cars of all characters is continued until June 30, 1947. May I say especially for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] that our cars—boxcars, freight cars, all types of cars—are depreciating rapidly. Many of them are being taken out of use, and they are not being constructed as rapidly as they are being removed from use, because of the age and dilapidated condition of these items of transportation.

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

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

Mr. RIZLEY. I think the committee has done a very good job. It has had a very severe task before it. However, in connection with this rail-transportation situation, I call the attention of the gentleman to a matter that is very, very serious, and shows exactly what the CPA and ODT are doing under the construction they put on their power under the Second War Powers Act. During the World War, cars for the transportation of propane and other liquefied gas, which as the gentleman knows is used quite extensively, became very short.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that cars used for the transportation of petroleum and oil also were very short.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right. So the Government built quite a number of these cars for the transportation of propane and allocated them to the various companies throughout the country that were

selling and distributing propane and liquid gases. Back as early as June of 1946 they found that they had a surplus of these cars. Several hundred of these cars were declared surplus and turned over to the War Assets Administration for the purpose of making disposition of them. The cars were already in use by companies that produce or transport liquid gas. Obviously if these cars were surplus, then everyone, I assume, would agree that they were not critical enough for someone to handle under the Second War Powers Act. Someone, however, conceived the idea that if they could get the CPA to declare that these cars which had been declared surplus were still essential to the national defense under the Second War Powers Act, they could bypass what the Congress said in respect to sales of surplus and have them allocated by the CPA and ODT. As a result of that, the CPA in January of this year took jurisdiction under title III of the Second War Powers Act and without making a finding that these cars were necessary for national defense, directed an allocation of them. The cars were all in use by various distributors of this fuel. There were 423 of these cars which had been declared surplus, and they took away some 200 of them which were being used by some of the companies and allocated them to other specific companies. Two of the men who made the allocation were on the pay roll of the company that benefited under the new allocation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course, that was a serious blunder on the part of those administering the law.

Mr. RIZLEY. Two of the men who made the allocation were on the pay roll of the company that got the cars. They made the allocation for the ODT. Thus, they used the War Powers Act to take cars away from certain companies who were using the cars in their business and gave them to other competing companies.

There was one little company down in Louisiana or Mississippi that had four of these cars. They took the cars away from that little company and turned them over to some of the larger groups who are in there now competing for the markets and customers of that little company.

Let me point out to the gentleman another case. A veteran of two wars who had been in business distributing propane gas since 1919 came back. He wanted to buy 200 of these cars. He had been advised by WAA they would be for sale at a certain time. In order to bypass him, CPA and ODT, decided that only the companies that had these cars leased were entitled to participate in this new allocation notwithstanding the fact that he was hauling the same kind of gas. They did not permit him to get a single one of those cars.

We had hearings for 2 days before our committee investigating war assets. We thought we had made a case so strong that the allocation would be reconsidered. But we hear this morning that if this act is continued these cars will be reallocated and directed under the same formula and will go to the same people designated in the original and in the same quantity. I understand the Attorney General on Saturday said the order was invalid because it was not made on the basis of a specific finding that the cars were necessary to national defense. I have had information this morning to the effect that, of course, it would be very easy to change that finding. Thus, they will be able to reallocate these cars. And this certain company has two of the allocators on its pay roll making the allocations.

I made that statement for the purpose of pointing out to the gentleman that in times of peace we should be mighty careful what we do in extending the powers of the President which were given to him in time of war because this matter of reallocation of cars does not affect cars only, but actually is a reallocation of markets. They are taking the markets of certain companies that sell and distribute propane gas and turning these markets over to some other companies which receive the 200 cars which they do not now have. The cars are very scarce although they have been declared surplus.

Does the gentleman take the position that the cars owned by the Government and used by these companies in this transportation business of propane is included under the provisions of this extension?

Mr. SPRINGER. My impression, is, and it was the impression of the conferees, insofar as it could be determined, that it embraced all rail transportation.

I wish to thank the gentleman for the observation that he has made. I hope the matters which he has stated on the floor of the House will be brought to the attention of those who have been violating this particular authority which is vested in them.

Under (d) "Allocation of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States"; that provision is identical with the one that was embraced in the measure that was passed by the House.

Coming now to subdivision (e) of section 1501—and if I may I would like to proceed and explain that subsection very briefly and then I will yield for questions—that subsection provides that allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments—and may I say in that connection that those items which are necessary to meet international commitments must comply with the two provisions which are contained in this particular conference report; that is, the item must have been allocated on March 24, 1947 or prior thereto. If on that date there was no allocation of the article, then it cannot be revived, but if it was allocated on March 24, 1947, and also, if it is certified by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce as provided in the pending report—it requires a certification by both of those Secretaries—that it is absolutely necessary to meet international commitments, then such allocation may be certified to further continue up until June 30, 1947. But if such article fails to come within either one of those classifications, that is, if it was not allocated on March 24, 1947, or that it was not absolutely necessary to meet international commitments, which facts must be certified to by both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, then there could be no allocation of such article, or articles, even for any international commitments.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to go back briefly to the boxcar situation, particularly with reference to the situation which the gentleman has just spoken of with reference to foreign commitments. Out our way we are probably going to lose a hundred million bushels of corn by reason of failure to get boxcars. Let me say to the gentleman, and to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], that while the ODT has something to do about it, the Association of American Railroads has something to do about allocations. But one of the things that I am concerned with is the question of how many of our new boxcar construction and new locomotives are being shipped out of the country. I wonder if the gentleman can advise me on that.

Mr. SPRINGER. As far as we could ascertain in the hearings, there was no evidence submitted that any are being shipped out of the country at the moment, but the construction of new box cars is far less than the depreciated and depleted cars that are being taken out of use.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand from hearings that we had a month ago a very large number of boxcars were being lined up to go out of the country.

Mr. O'HARA. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPRINGER. The information we received was only from the departments of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Did you have Colonel Johnson of the ODT there?

Mr. SPRINGER. He was present and testified. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. What I wanted to say with reference to that point is that the economy of this country is being seriously impaired by the shortage of railroad transportation. I think we need to keep some of this material here to take care of our own economy.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say I entirely agree with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota on that subject.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. The observation I wanted to make is this, that without control of any kind they could ship out all the box cars or other equipment they desire. So I take it the gentleman favors some kind of control, because that will prevent the shipping of cars out of the country. The committee has gone on the

theory that we should eliminate controls just as rapidly as possible, but I can see that with no controls at all, they could ship out as many box cars or anything else they may desire regardless of what our needs are at home. The gentleman is entirely correct. I thank him for that observation.

Mr. O'HARA. Until we had these controls I did not know that we were shipping boxcars out of the country.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the chairman for that observation.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should like to get the gentleman's idea on some of the matters involved in subparagraph (e). It states in part that the Secretaries of State and Commerce shall certify in the event they find it necessary to meet international commitments. Referring to foods, grains, fats, oils, and such commodities, to whom do the Secretaries of State and Commerce certify?

Mr. SPRINGER. They would certify to those who were seeking to send these materials out of the country to meet international commitments. That would probably be to the Secretary of Agriculture or to some department which was seeking to send those materials away.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then, if it were the Secretary of Agriculture and it related to food, the Secretaries of State and Commerce would certify such facts to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that would be the basis of the authority.

It also refers to certain commitments that the Secretaries of State and Commerce certify to. Are those commitments that are in effect and have been made on March 24?

Mr. SPRINGER. Those are commitments that were in existence. There was no definite date fixed as to when the commitment was required to have been made, but it is a commitment which must be in existence between this country and other countries, and at the time this extension becomes effective, if, in fact, the extension requested is granted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then if the commitment is in existence it will be carried forward under the power of subparagraph (e); but assuming that some new commitment should be made next week or the week after this conference report is approved and the bill signed by the President, would those new commitments made after such approval date come within the purview of this subparagraph (e)?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not the intent of this act to embrace or recognize future commitments. And may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that I think the one redeeming feature with respect to this conference report is the shortness of time during which these allocations may continue, up to June 30, 1947. Always remember that the bill which was passed in the House provided that certain items were continued beyond the date of June 30, 1947, and until December 31, 1947. That date has been shortened to the 30th of June, 1947.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman attempt, if he can, to answer the question about new commitments made after this conference report is approved?

Mr. SPRINGER. This subject was not mentioned in the conference; it was not mentioned by any of the conferees, and it was not intended that it should relate to any new commitments. Commitments already existing prior to the passage of this act would come within its purview, only.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I wish to concur in what the gentleman from Indiana has just said.

It was the intent without any question of doubt that commitments existing at the time this law becomes effective are the only commitments coming within its purview. Otherwise, the President, who plans and directs our foreign policy, could make such allocation as he might see fit at any time by simply making additional commitments.

The language was changed from that of the original bill which said "International arrangements and understandings." That language was too indefinite and the conferees agreed that we should use the word "commitments." What does the word "commitment" mean? It means something we are committed to do at the time we use the word. That is what it is intended to mean.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The fact of the matter is that that language was employed so there can be no misunderstanding as to our willingness and intention to fulfill commitments already made.

Mr. MICHENER. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If there were any new commitments, they would have to come before the Congress again to get authority and legislation to handle any new commitments?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in that assertion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman about imports. Does this conference report give any authority to the Government to license, control, or restrict imports of fats and oils and also raw materials from which fats and oils are derived?

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not give any specific authority, and may I say that during the time the hearings were held, especially by subcommittee 4 of the House, the evidence indicated that in connection with fats and oils, which included also the importation of coconuts, and like commodities for crushing purposes, and copra, in that connection it was decided it was not necessary that there be any allocation upon those particular commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Does the conference report give any authority to the Government to limit or restrict, direct, on control the processing or manufacture of grains into flour, or fats and oils into any other commodity in connection with the carrying out of these commitments?

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not except that which might be found under subdivisions D and E. Those are the only places where there could be any possible authority by any stretch of the imagination. It is my judgment that such power is not granted in this report.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman would not want to concede that the Secretary of Agriculture or any other Government official would have the right to put on rationing again or, for instance, to require the manufacture of 80 percent extraction of flour, or such other restrictions, or even set aside orders for meat?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not concede that that authority is embraced in this act, and it is my independent judgment that it is not embraced in it. I know that question was not discussed by the conferees.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then that cannot be read into the conference report, as long as the gentleman who has so ably handled this bill has stated that that authority is not conferred by any language of the conference report?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing in this report. By way of recapitulation, in order to clarify the record and avoid possible confusion, may I ask the gentleman to again reassure the House as to the date involved in this legislation. As I understand the gentleman, by this act you are continuing the Second War Powers Act for the items mentioned herein from March 31 to June 30, this year. Is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. We are continuing only certain items under title III of that act and for the purposes set forth in this conference report; that is all. That extension extends only until June 30, 1947.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to get the date fixed certain and definitely. That is June 30 of this year?

Mr. SPRINGER. This power is extended only to June 30, 1947.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Am I correct in assuming from what the gentleman says that after June 30 of this year this act will not exist for any purpose whatsoever?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It exists to that date only for the articles and for the purposes mentioned therein?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman elicited any information as to the commitments with reference to the export of fats and oils in this country, particularly for the next quarter. The reason I ask that is that I have heard rather persistent rumors that during

this next quarter the industries of this country will be facing an absolute and terrific shortage of fats and oils for industrial purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. There was no information on the question of requirements for export of those particular articles. We asked questions when the hearing was held before the subcommittee but there was no information forthcoming upon that particular subject, so we are without information.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Am I correct in my recollection when I state that when the House bill passed and was substituted for the Senate bill that fertilizer, among other items, was excluded from allocation after March 31?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. It was excluded.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My second question is whether or not fertilizers, including ammonium nitrate and other nitrates, are included in the conference report for allocation after March 31, and if so, under what title?

Mr. SPRINGER. They are not included, and the only way they could be included would be under (d) or (e), and it is my best judgment that the only place they could be included would be under (e) in order to meet international commitments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, if they are included, as the gentleman states they may be under the language of (e), that would have reference only to the commitments that have been made to conclude up to the 30th of June?

Mr. SPRINGER. That would only have to do with commitments which are already made prior to the passage of this conference report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so, but what I am saying is that the power to make the allocations, in order to carry out those commitments, will expire under the terms of this act, including fertilizer, as the gentleman said, if it can be included at all, on June 30.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. As he will remember, the bill which passed the House provided that those items might be extended for allocation purposes until December 31, 1947, but the conferees have reduced that period from December 31 to June 30, 1947.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That did not include fertilizer, because it was excluded in the House bill for the items that could be extended to December 31.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, but section (e) is in that same bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that that is very important. Will the Civilian Production Administration or its successor under the guise of power to carry out the commitments be able to make allocations that will not be effectuated after June 30, or will the power to make any allocation of any kind be effective after June 30 under the terms of this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. On June 30, 1947, this bill terminates.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And any power of allocation is terminated?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think our intent ought to be absolutely clear in that regard.

Mr. SPRINGER. And all our machinery with respect to carrying out the allocations will terminate on that date.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think it is exceedingly important that our intent should be clear because the fact is that under the War Powers Act the Civilian Production Administration undertook to provide for the allocation of ammonium nitrates and other fertilizers in this country over the period ending June 30, 1947, before this act expired when by law that power expired on March 31, and I want it definitely understood—and if I am not correct I want to be corrected—that the power of allocation will expire and no allocation that is to be carried out after June 30 will be effective, whether it carries fertilizers, fats, grain, or any other item.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct, and that is my interpretation of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed to me that it was advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to repeal the War Powers Act as quickly as possible. I think the strongest evidence of the wisdom of that came today when we heard the splendid explanation made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with respect to sugar. What the Committee on the Judiciary has endeavored to do with this bill has been to terminate these controls on the 30th of June, so that if it should become necessary to make allocations or exercise controls because of the worldwide shortages, then the appropriate legislative committee of the House should take the necessary action. It seems to me and to the other conferees that reducing the date during which this act is operative to June 30 would serve as a notice to those people in interest, those people in the appropriate committees of the House, and those in the executive branch of the Government that the time within which they should take action is short.

The Colmer committee—the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning—in its carefully considered report on the extension of wartime controls unanimously recommended especially the extension of export and import controls. See the ninth report, pages 99 and 100 and the appendix, part 2, pages 6–8, and the eleventh report, pages 107 and 108.

The reasons for the retention of these controls, either through an extension of the Second War Powers Act or through special legislation dealing specifically with export and import controls and the allocations power necessary to support them, can be briefly stated as three:

First. Persistent shortages on a worldwide basis will make necessary the direction of some commodities in short supply produced in the United States to the areas of greatest relief need and to support our Army and the purposes of our occupation. Buying for these purposes against unlimited world demand would greatly increase government costs and might not get short supply at the right time to the right place.

Second. The inflationary effects of the removal of both export and import controls will add the most dangerous pressure that can be brought to bear in the wage-price spiral, because of the world shortage of some of the most necessary commodities that enter into the family budget. This shortage would be increased to a marked degree within the American market by the removal of these controls.

Third. The international equilibrium of supplies needed for the most necessary subsistence abroad would be upset "if the overwhelming buying power of the American market, stripped of price controls, were turned loose on the world market for sugar, fats, and oils, and several other commodities in very short supply by the removal of import controls"—Colmer report.

Accompanying this memorandum is a list of potential bottlenecks to maximum production which show, according to the latest Department of Commerce estimates, basic shortages in lead, copper, tin, crude rubber, and so forth. A separate study of steel is not yet available but the indicated shortage against world demand added to American reconversion needs cannot run annually to less than 500,000 tons of strip and sheet steel alone, and may well run nearer to a million tons, if our foreign program, as indicated by the President, is to be fulfilled.

These shortages drastically limit the capacity for building new freight cars, whose growing scarcity at present constitutes the greatest bottleneck to the healthy functioning of American industry. They also seriously affect the locomotive program, not only for this country but for export. A brief note on this is contained on page 7 of the accompanying memo from the Department of Commerce.

Soda ash is one among several chemicals that are having a severe restrictive effect upon American industry and is causing serious deficiencies in production at home and abroad, notably for the glass needed in building and reconstruction. In the manufacture of chemical and caustic soda, it is also a limiting factor, if present shortages continue, in the production of nonferrous metals, pulp and paper, soap, water softeners, some types of textiles, and petroleum products.

On the food and agricultural commodities front, the severest shortage which is producing industrial bottlenecks, as well as food shortages, occurs in the vegetable oils. This is treated on pages 11 and 12 with statistics on page 13 of the accompanying memo, which shows industrial shortages that would be increased largely by exports of fats and oils.

A world shortage of grain and cereal products has produced the highest prices in history, largely because of the approaching or anticipated removal of export controls. The immediate effect can be seen in the rise of the price of a loaf of bread to 15 cents, with prospects of going still higher.

Many other users of grain, including corn for the corn starch used by most in-

dustries, are facing serious difficulties of supply comparable to the industrial bottlenecks which are due to a shortage of fats and oils.

Fiber shortages on a world scale still persist in hemp, sisal, and other materials used for binder twine and rope. Cotton has reached once more the highest price since just after the Civil War in a speculative market resulting from prospective disappearance of controls.

In most of these shortage factors a removal of all barriers from the products of the United States for export would open competitive bidding by starved markets, rapidly exhausting the dollar exchange available, but in the meantime further temporarily inflating the American market with the attendant dangers of producing an inflationary crash.

Even in the consumer durable goods and in other American products uncontrolled exports present grave dangers. A second-hand American car commands a price of $20,000 in Syria today. Although this is an extreme instance, there are many indications of a general worldwide demand that would drain short American supplies before the pipe lines are filled for the domestic market, with the inevitable accompanying increase in prices.

The pipe lines are filling in many cases very rapidly to the point where the removal of export controls will afford no real danger, but the process is selective and differs widely with differing products and materials.

It is manifestly impossible to shape adequate legislation to supply the selectivity necessary in the extension of the Second War Powers Act. It seems absolutely essential, therefore, that the Second War Powers Act should be extended from the date of its termination, which is now set for March 31, on an emergency basis, to the date set for the expiration of the National Defense Act of June 28, 1940, which has been extended to June 30, 1947. The critical character of the international situation, as well as the short time limits available for considered action by Congress both denote the wisdom of the extension of the Second War Powers Act to June 30, 1947, so that mature consideration may be given to adequate new legislation on a selective basis.

POTENTIAL BOTTLENECKS TO MAXIMUM PRODUCTION—SELECTED LIST OF COMMODITIES—NOTE

The following material was extracted from a report prepared by the Office of Domestic Commerce for the Secretary of Commerce entitled "Preliminary Report on Potential Bottlenecks to Maximum Production." Several revisions and additions have been made to bring the material up to date. The report was not prepared in the detail needed to gain a full understanding of the industrial bottlenecks situation but to establish some preliminary facts to be expanded upon at some later date. Because of their special significance, certain commodities, such as steel, have been omitted from this presentation.

SUMMARY

It should be possible to achieve maximum output in most industries in 1947. However, a number of weak spots are still apparent which may cause continued shortages in certain products beyond this year. The greatest potential deterrent toward balancing supply and demand factors is the possibility of a recurring series of strikes. However, this brief summary deals with only material and production bottlenecks and assumes availability of the full labor force.

Bottlenecks which may cause continued shortages over an extended period fall into two categories:

First. Lack of adequate plant capacities: It is our considered opinion that total current production facilities for finished products and expansion under way are ample to meet most of the demand during 1947, provided the necessary raw materials and components are produced in adequate volume. Two possible exceptions to this are steel and soda ash where any delay in plant construction programs may delay a balancing until sometime in 1948.

Second. Basic raw materials shortages: The remaining deterrents to full production can be found in the supply situation of a small number of basic raw materials. Typically, the short-supply position of these materials result not only from high domestic demand but from the chaotic conditions surrounding production in foreign areas. The solution to some of these shortages rests in a large degree upon increased production in foreign countries.

LEAD

Lead presents the most serious problem of all the metals, both short-term and long-term, both domestically and internationally. Consumption in 1946 was 30 percent below demand and, under the best outlook for 1947, supplies will still be 22 to 25 percent short of needs approximating 1,300,000 short tons. The unsettled state of world production and supplies complicates any appraisal of the domestic situation.

World production is substantially below prewar and war levels, for the following reasons: the depletion of developed ore reserves, the absence of new discoveries, the destruction of certain mining properties, as in Burma, and interruptions to production resulting from labor disturbances. At the same time, world demand is at a very high level, and shortages are expected to continue for some time.

The demand pressures derive principally from the following: First, a high level of demand on the part of lead-consuming industries, including some carryover from 1946 as a result of the loss of production because of strikes in some of the mines, smelters, and refineries in this country as well as a mine strike in Mexico, the principal source of United States imports; second, continued limited mine production in this country because of the depletion of reserves and manpower deficits; and third, very limited imports because of the world shortage and international competition or commitments, as in the case of a shift of Australian lead which was an important part of United States supply during the war to Great Britain. Thus, despite the Government subsidy of imports during most of 1946 at the world price, receipts into this country were only a little more than one-half of 1945 imports.

With the end of control, the cessation of Government imports shifted the responsibility for supplementing domestic supplies to private industry, at the same time reinstating the tariff duty. While higher prices should bring forth some increase in supply, both from domestic and foreign sources, consumer resistance may be met with the possibility of substitutes. Some substitution has already been operative, as in the switch to titanium in the manufacture of paints, and the use of copper and brass tubing for lead pipe. Another possible substitution may be made through the use of iron carbonyl in the place of tetraethyl lead in connection with high-test gasoline production.

While increased substitution would have the effect of reducing pressure on the short supply of lead, in many of its uses no satisfactory substitute has been developed. This is true in the case of storage batteries, which is the principal user of lead, taking about 30 percent of total consumption in a normal peacetime pattern. While the production of storage batteries has been maintained at fairly high levels through the allocation of lead to that purpose in the past, there is no assurance that in a free market continued satisfactory production can be kept up. Under the stringent supply conditions that still exist, an increase to one type of use is simply a drain on another.

Salient statistics on lead, 1939–46

[In short tons lead content]

	Domestic mine production [1]	Domestic secondary production [1]	Imports [2]		Exports pigs and bars [2]	Total stocks, end of period [3]	Consumption [4]
			Ore, flue dust, and matte and base bullion	Pigs, bars, and scrap			
1937–39 average	415,380	247,147	44,566	4,906	[5] 74,392	(6)	630,567
1940	456,613	260,346	91,461	38,622	23,755	(6)	782,000
1941	460,764	397,416	109,711	329,350	14,359	203,618	1,050,000
1942	495,824	323,001	137,191	389,233	1,940	445,684	1,026,672
1943	453,113	342,094	87,538	247,951	2,003	390,716	
1944	416,817	331,416	104,924	233,865	15,523	287,531	
1945	390,820	363,039	71,628	254,862	1,407	292,656	1,051,601
1946	332,478	365,966	28,836	104,778	597	201,644	956,476

[1] Bureau of Mines.
[2] Bureau of the Census.
[3] Civilian Production Administration.
[4] 1937–41, American Bureau of Metal Statistics; 1942–46, Civilian Production Administration.
[5] 1939 only.
[6] Not available.

COPPER

Copper demand will approach 2,100,000 short tons in 1947, with supplies 25 to 30 percent short of this amount. The maximization of all supply factors would need to be realized to meet the full demand and this does not appear likely. Consumption in 1946 was maintained only by heavy withdrawals from stocks.

To meet 1947 needs domestic primary production would have to exceed 800,000 tons and imports rise to about the same amount. Production will be curtailed by a continued shortage of labor, war depletion of working deposits, and the removal of some marginal operations in the absence of subsidy support. Copper prices are not expected to rise sufficiently to maintain all the marginal operations kept going by the wartime premium price plan. Secondary production should be somewhat higher and may approach 600,000 tons.

The foreign supplies which will be made available to us is most unpredictable. Imports are very important in meeting our current high level of demand—double prewar requirements—which has made the United States a net importer of copper. With the Government no longer the sole importer in a pooled world market, receipts will be limited by competition with foreign purchasers and the import duties on entries into this country. Imports in 1946 were sharply reduced as a result of labor difficulties in Chile, our principal foreign source, as well as from diversion of part of the Chilean output to other prewar customers. Supplies of Belgian Congo and Canadian copper, which came to the United States during the war, are now being partially diverted to Great Britain.

The shortage of copper which will last at least through 1947, will continue to restrict production in many instances, particularly in the durable goods field, just as it has ever since VJ-day. High demands by the construction industry, power companies, appliance manufacturers, in automobile components, and so forth, will maintain a steady pressure on inadequate supplies.

Salient statistics on copper

[Short tons]

Year	Domestic mine production [1]	Domestic secondary production [1]	Imports		Stocks of refined copper, end of year [3]	Exports of refined copper	Apparent consumption [4]
			Ores and concentrates [2]	Other manufactured copper [2]			
1937-39 average	709,360	320,000	24,528	196,786	(5)	346,129	904,000
1940	878,086	334,000	31,222	333,775	127,300	356,431	1,292,000
1941	958,149	413,000	42,784	677,924	140,273	103,602	2,001,000
1942	1,080,061	427,000	67,678	714,682	152,416	131,406	2,032,000
1943	1,090,818	428,000	68,709	667,570	270,352	175,859	1,907,000
1944	972,549	457,000	59,874	706,200	397,417	68,373	1,774,000
1945	772,894	560,000	57,936	838,261	548,270	48,563	1,839,000
1946	602,355	540,000	30,730	329,068	168,610	52,629	1,794,000

[1] Bureau of Mines; 1946 secondary production estimated.
[2] Bureau of the Census.
[3] Civilian Production Administration.
[4] Computed by Office of Domestic Commerce.
[5] Not available.

TIN

A foreseeable new supply of 85,000 long tons of tin in 1947 to meet a probable demand of at least 100,000 tons indicates a deficit of about 15 percent. The shortage will mean the continuation of the serious restrictive effects on consumption which were experienced during the war and up to the present time. The shortage is world-wide, resulting from drastically reduced output in the principal producing areas of both metal and concentrates.

The United States produces only negligible quantities of tin from domestic mines and is, therefore, dependent upon foreign sources for primary tin, either in the form of metal or concentrates. The latter are processed in the only tin smelter in this country, which is located in Texas. This smelter was built in anticipation of the loss of far-eastern sources, such as developed after the begining of the war with Japan. In 1946 this smelter produced about 45,000 tons. To help alleviate the world shortage of tin, as well as to provide a bargaining point with the British and Dutch, who are in control of most of the tin producing areas in the Far East, it appears advisable to maintain the Texas smelter in operation for some years to come, even under Government subsidy. The chief source of concentrates has been Bolivia, although the relatively low grade of Bolivian tin has made it necessary to mix it with material from the Far East.

The current world shortage began in 1941 with the invasion of the far-eastern producing areas by the Japanese. The total salvage of tin from the quantities produced under the Japanese regime during the war amounted to about 41,000 tons, while production in the Far East in 1946 is estimated at from 24,000 to 30,000 tons. These quantities compare with an annual prewar output in that area of 160,000 tons. This poor showing, a result of several factors—the condition of the mines, lack of equipment, political unrest, inadequate food supplies—has been the primary factor in the world shortage. While output in 1947 is expected to be improved, full production is not anticipated before 1948 or 1949.

The principal use of tin is in the manufacture of tin plate. The harmful effects of the shortage have been lessened in this respect by the increased use of electrolytic tin plating, which requires less tin than the older method of hot dipping. In most other uses tin is so small a part, in volume, of the finished product in which it is contained as not to appear significant. Actually, however, as a component, with lead, for solder used in automobile manufacture, its shortage has been a serious bottleneck.

Salient statistics for tin, 1937-46

[In long tons tin content]

Year	World production	Domestic production (primary and secondary)	Imports of metal	Exports	Total domestic stocks, end of period	Apparent consumption
1937-39 [1]	183,667	[2] 24,700	69,305	(4)	(4)	77,444
1940	236,000	31,091	124,816	(4)	(4)	97,154
1941	240,000	39,339	140,873	(4)	143,370	134,695
1942	125,000	50,068	26,753	244	144,361	85,687
1943	127,000	55,289	11,919	398	125,544	80,330
1944	105,000	59,984	13,338	405	107,212	89,969
1945	87,000	71,875	8,440	708	91,623	83,583
1946	[3] 90,000	68,089	15,258	859	77,925	80,234

[1] Average.
[2] Tin content of ores used direct to make alloys not included.
[3] Preliminary estimate.
[4] Not available.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines, Civilian Production Administration, and U. S. Bureau of the Census.

RAILROAD EQUIPMENT

The shortage of freight cars is probably the worst in the capital-goods field. The exacting war demands on the railroad industry were met, but at the expense of wear and tear on inadequate equipment. Today, as one of the results of that experience, there are about 50,000 fewer cars in operation than at the beginning of 1946, in the face of unprecedented peacetime demands on the transportation system. In fact, without the wartime regulations which brought intensified use of freight cars, the present requirements in terms of cars are even greater than during the war.

The Association of American Railroads has announced that replies from members indicate they could use an additional 130,000 news cars at once. Estimates of ODT set replacement requirements at several hundred thousand cars over the next few years.

The freight-car-building industry had 90,000 cars on order as of March 12, enough to keep it running at theoretical capacity—about 15,000 units per month—for some 6 months. There are, however, no expectations that such capacity operations will be achieved. Without enough steel to go around to all consumers, the program of the industry calls for enough materials to produce 10,000 domestic cars per month, which compares with the 3,500 per month rate of 1946.

This present program, more than three times the 1946 average monthly production, is one which has been expanded since the first of the year as a result of a series of conferences between the car builders, steel producers, ODT, CPA, and a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Some doubt has been raised as to the supply of components other than steel but preliminary findings of ODT indicate the 10,000 car-a-month schedule can be reached by July. The most serious threat to the schedule appears to be pig iron which is required for 8,000

of the 10,000 sets of wheels needed monthly as well as for air brakes.

Difficulties in the passenger car field extend beyond steel and other basic materials into a serious lack of components. During 1946 cars which were nearly completed were held up by a shortage of electrical and air-conditioning equipment—motors, blowers, fans, fitting panels, transformers, generators, lighting fixtures—curtains, carpets, linoleum, plumbing fixtures, and so forth. The same situation is expected to plague the industry during at least part of 1947. The production of passenger cars averaged about 60 cars per month in 1946, considerably below capacity.

Locomotive builders are similarly troubled by shortages of basic materials, particularly steel and cooper. Boiler plates and tubes are among the most difficult items to obtain. Components, such as electrical equipment used on Diesel-electrics, are likewise short. Due to lack of materials one leading locomotive firm recently furloughed 75 percent of its personnel for 1 week.

Salient figures on railroad freight cars

	Cars delivered [1]—		Cars in service, end of year [2]	Cars retired [2]
	For domestic service	For export		
1937-39 average	39,700	771	1,720,074	85,944
1940	62,241	1,734	1,675,080	72,030
1941	80,623	2,386	1,725,437	40,781
1942	62,873	8,529	1,769,120	70,059
1943	31,836	43,117	1,780,520	26,086
1944	43,003	38,759	1,794,135	30,987
1945	43,864	10,658	1,784,674	45,840
1946	41,967	17,631	1,739,930	78,093

[1] American Railway Car Institute.
[2] Association of American Railroads, class I railroads only.

SODA ASH

A probable output of 4,500,000 short tons of soda ash this year may fail to meet all demands by approximately 250,000 tons. There is little likelihood of the deficit being met by imports from areas in a more serious supply position than that in this country. Normally imports add only negligible amounts to our domestic supply. Several new plants are under construction but, while some should be in production by the end of the year, no substantial increase in production is expected before 1948. A speeding up of the building of these plants which might be effected will help alleviate the short supply outlook.

The largest consuming areas restricted by lack of soda ash are the glass industry which takes 25 to 30 percent of the output, and the production of caustic soda and the manufacture of other chemicals, each taking about a fifth of soda ash production. Other smaller uses are in the production of nonferrous metals, pulp and paper, soap, water softeners, industrial and household uses, textiles, and petroleum products.

Foreign demands in excess of local production exert a pressure for export in the United States market, but during 1946 outgoing shipments amounted to only 1½ percent of our output. There is a world-wide shortage of soda ash. The United Kingdom, formerly a leading world producer of this chemical, is faced with a very critical situation, and its exports are at a low ebb. Continental countries report serious deficits of soda ash—Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. France, although in an improved position, has been producing at less than the prewar monthly average. The exchange of Italian soda ash for United States coal has been suggested as a partial solution, but the possibility of such an arrangement appears remote. In Japan the current rate of production is low and none is at present available for export.

Salient statistics on soda ash, 1937–46

[Thousands of short tons]

	Production	Exports	Producers' stocks, end of year	Consumption
1937-39 average	[1] 2,948	62	(2)	[1] 2,964
1940	(2)	59	(2)	(2)
1941	3,724	83	39	(2)
1942	3,925	64	109	(2)
1943	4,571	153	27	4,696
1944	4,718	79	62	4,692
1945	4,557	70	[3] 36	4,581
1946	4,497	67	(2)	4,490

[1] 1939 only.
[2] Not available.
[3] As of Sept. 30.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, except consumption data which are from Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering Magazine.

FATS AND OILS BOTTLENECKS

Total supplies of fats and oils in the 1946–47 crop year, ending in September 1947, will fall short of unrestricted demand for 10,700,000,000 pounds by about 1,600,000,000, with per capita consumption at about 90 percent of the 1937–41 average.

Some realization of the effects of this limitation of supplies is obtained from the list of the industries whose output is restricted because of insufficient fats and oils. In the edible field, shortening, margarine, cooking and salad oils, salad dressings, and mayonnaise are the largest users. In inedible uses, soap, paints and varnishes, and linoleum and oilcloth are most important. To the American businessman the restricted supplies mean the inability to meet the current demand and the necessity of paying higher prices to obtain raw materials for his operations. This particularly affects the small businessman who is unable to store large amounts of fats and must, therefore, enter the market for current supplies. The lack of paints and linoleum has an indirect effect in connection with the desired expansion of housing, and adds to the difficulties encountered by the construction industry. To the consumer the restricted output is reflected not only in lower availability but also in a gradually ascending retail price.

An indication of the efforts being made by the American industry to overcome the bottlenecks imposed by current low supplies is represented in the field of soap and soap-type products. Any marked increase in production of soap is dependent upon increased imports of copra from the Philippine Islands. Soap sales in 1946 of 2,300,000,000 pounds were the lowest since 1935. However, output of soap-type products is increasing. These are called synthetic detergents and are made from fatty oils and from petroleum derivatives. The growth of output from petroleum derivatives is progressing at such a rate that they may permanently cut into the market for the more traditional types of soap made principally from domestic tallow and grease and coconut oil from Philippine copra. The position of the small soaper under such conditions would be particularly difficult.

The current rate of disappearance of our principle edible oils shows the difficulties of the shortening and margarine industries. Based on an estimated 1946–47 production of 950,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil and beginning stocks of 306,000,000 pounds, total supplies of this product in the current season are 1,256,000,000 pounds. By March 1, 1947, 63 percent of total supplies had been consumed, compared with 47 percent disappearance in the same period of the 1945–46 crop year. In the case of soybean oil, by March 1, 1947, we had consumed 41.6 percent of our supplies, compared with 35.4 percent utilized in the same period of the preceding season, with consumption currently increasing. Thus, it is clear that supplies of edible oils are disappearing at a rate in excess of that justified by crop-year estimates, and before the end of the season, probably in June and July, many members of the industry will be forced to curtail output even further or stop operating.

In the drying oil field the current purchase from Argentina of 40,000 tons of linseed oil should carry the drying oil industry over on a limited scale until the receipt of supplies from the new crop. Short supplies of pigments also act as a deterrent to increased output of paint products.

Two major reasons for the current bottlenecks in fats and oils are the relatively low output from domestic materials in the 1946–47 crop year and the necessity for shipping supplies from this country and from our normal import sources to European nations. Production from domestic materials in the 1946–47 crop year is expected to reach 9,200,000,000 pounds, which while larger than the 8,900,000,000 produced in 1945–46, is 2,000,000,000 pounds under the wartime peak in 1943–44. Part of the reason for this lower production is the emphasis placed on production of cereal grains for shipment overseas, with which vegetable oils seeds compete for acreage.

Although the United States was on a net import basis in 1947 by 220,000,000 pounds, the first time since 1942, this was only a small amount as compared with prewar net imports of some 1,500,000,000 pounds. The necessity for curtailing our position is the result of fat shortages abroad. World supplies in 1947 are estimated at 15 to 20 percent below the average for the immediate prewar years, and countries are reported to be giving fat imports a priority second only to wheat. Part of the reason for the reduced world output is tied up with the policies of countries with colonial sources of supply. These countries have shown a determination to retain the exportable supplies of their colonies and at the same time

have not taken steps to encourage production. The maintenance of price stability has been given precedence to increasing output through raising the prices for fats and oils.

As a result of the lowered world output countries have been obtaining supplies from areas normally the source of United States imports. This applies principally to the Republic of the Philippines. Before the war the United States obtained some 80 percent of Philippine exports of copra. In 1947, if the tentative allocations of the IEFC are carried out, this country will receive only about 40 percent of the total shipped.

Thus the availability of fats and oils in the United States is directly affected by actions in overseas countries. It is recognized that this country's per capita consumption at about 90 percent of prewar is considerably more favorable than that of many European nations which report about 75 percent to 80 percent of prewar usage. However, the United States has taken all possible steps to build up domestic supplies through support price programs and development of Philippine supplies through the Copra Export Marketing Corporations. It therefore becomes a matter of policy how much domestic operations should be curtailed in the interests of nations which for one reason or another cannot be considered to have taken all possible steps to develop their own supplies.

Salient statistics on fats and oils

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Primary fats and oils (crude bases)		Stocks, end of period	Foreign trade [1]		
	Production from domestic materials	Domestic disappearance		Imports	Exports and reexports	Net imports
1937-41 average	8,230	9,769	2,303	2,060	472	1,588
1942	9,983	10,308	2,017	973	937	36
1943	10,847	10,089	2,151	1,028	1,587	−559
1944	10,839	10,306	2,156	1,045	1,589	−544
1945	9,427	9,843	1,726	931	1,026	−95
1946	8,846	9,331	1,264	999	779	220

[1] Includes oil content of oilseeds, other products on full-weight basis.

Source: Derived from U. S. Department of Commerce figures except production of butter and lard obtained from U. S. Department of Agriculture.

(Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The bill we had the other day provided for some terminations on December 31. This bill provides for terminations of all allocations of so-called critical materials and of regulations now in effect upon June 30 of this year.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am wondering if the committee can tell us how soon the different departments of the Government will be in asking for a continuation of some of these controls.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is one question that I cannot answer, of course, and the conferees cannot answer.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman does anticipate, does he not, that they will be in asking for the continuation of some of these controls?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is speculative entirely. No one can tell.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the deadline is the 30th of June. These controls expire then. That gives these agencies which might desire to ask for a continuation of controls an opportunity to go before the several legislative committees having jurisdiction just as they have done before the Committee on Banking and Currency on sugar this morning, before the Committee on Armed Services on rubber the other day, and before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on shipping; so that after all is said and done, the policy of the country rests in the hands of Congress, and the gentleman and I and the others here must act affirmatively if controls are to be continued beyond June 30.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If all controls are dropped on June 30, how many persons presently employed to handle these controls will be eliminated from the pay roll?

Mr. SPRINGER. There will be several thousand of them. I had a superficial report from the various departments, from the ODT and the CPA. As I recall, they had already reduced the number more than 3,000, and, of course, on June 30 several thousand people will go off the payroll.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Lord hasten the day.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the few crumbs of comfort that are contained in the conference report are deeply appreciated. There is only one addition to the House bill, and that is to allocate abaca and the agave fiber and cordage.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am always so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That also will result in cutting into the amount of manila available. The amount that has been purchased since private purchases started has run up from 30,000 bales a month to 60,000 bales, and now it will go back.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, we are always illumined by and appreciate the knowledge that we get from the distinguished gentleman. That is exactly why we need the allocation power. We need it to keep those two large firms that have a monopoly from getting all of the hard fiber without which we cannot possibly have a string to tie up the farmers' crops, a string that will not stretch and "spill the beans." We are not as dumb as some people think we are.

Mr. TABER. It will simply accentuate your shortage because you will have less hemp to manufacture into rope.

Mr. HOBBS. But such as may be, whether much or little, will give the small businessman a chance to stay in business who does not have the purchasing power nor the mighty organizations of their dominating competitors.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to you, sir, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who deserted us and whose association we enjoyed so greatly when he would associate with us of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'HARA. I express my appreciation to the gentleman for his remarks, but I am very much concerned with not only the question of allocation but the question of how long that allocation will go on. Consider fertilizers and fats and oils. We have been told that allocation definitely ends on June 30. For how long a time can this authority under the War Powers Act last? Will the gentleman state whether that means that delivery is to be made by that time or can they go on allocating for 5 years under this extension of the War Powers Act?

Mr. HOBBS. For the first time since my mind has been occupied with a study of this bill, and that means for several years, that is the only one question that I cannot possibly answer. I can answer almost any question that may be propounded at any time by anybody because if I do not know, I can say so, and that is an answer to the question.

But here we have a situation where we are solemnly assured that only the outstanding commitments that have been made will come under subsection E of title III. Therefore, no commitment that was made, so Mr. WHITTINGTON's argument runs, which is to be performed after today—in other words, by midnight tonight—every allocation that has been made and every commitment that has been made will expire with today. Then we are just as solemnly assured by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who handled the bill that no other commitments can be made after midnight tonight under any circumstances to extend for as long as it takes you to snap your fingers, and, therefore, it would seem that if both of those statements be logical and true these sections amount to less than nothing—a few wasted words—for no control is vested by the conference report that was not being exercised on March 24, 1947.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, but I do have a statement which I wish to make, sir.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman for yielding so much of his time but the point that still bothers me is that we do not know as far as the economy of this country is concerned what allocations have been made and for how long a time, let us say on fertilizers and fats and oils. They could extend for a long period of time. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know, sir. I do not know whether there is any power under heaven for one second of time to make any allocation even if it had been made before today or if it might be attempted tomorrow. My judgment about the matter is that it is highly probable that any commitments—and that is a strong word—any commitment that has been made by this Government, not only I but every other gentleman of this House, and particularly including the gentleman from Minnesota who has just asked the question, ought to be glad, if the commitment has been made by our Government, no matter whether we agree with it or not, to live up to it "if it takes the hide." I believe that would be the gentleman's attitude and I know it is mine. Now, how long, under the technical construction of this conference report that power will last, or that authority extend, I do not know and I do not believe anybody else knows.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman mentioned my name. Will he permit me to say what my idea is?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. I appreciate it, but the chairman of the subcommittee also rose and before the gentleman did on this particular question and therefore I will have to yield to my genial friend from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman very much.

May I say to the gentleman from Alabama and for the benefit of the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Minnesota, under the original act, the Second War Powers Act of 1942, does not the gentleman believe that any allocations made under that act could not be made beyond the date when the act was to expire?

Mr. HOBBS. I am perfectly sure that no allocation could have been made legally, which was made after the date on which the act was fixed to expire by law.

Mr. SPRINGER. And does not the distinguished gentleman from Alabama now state that the same rule would obtain with reference to this date of June 30, 1947?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do. Both of those things are perfectly clear. As far as whether or not they would have the power during this interim period to make a commitment that might extend beyond June 30, I do not know. I am perfectly sure that there has never been any attempt to do so; there never would be and there could not be a legal attempt to thwart the purposes of the law in order to do that thing, and there would not be. But I can very easily see that if you had a cargo of any one of the materials that were subject to allocation until June 30, on the high seas, and because of a storm, perhaps shipwrecked the vessel, you could not stop that shipment nor would you want to, if there was a commitment of your Government that it should be delivered.

Mr. O'HARA. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir, I'm glad to.

Mr. O'HARA. I would agree with the gentleman on the seriousness of commitments, but I do think that we should write into this report that the delivery date had to be by June 30, 1947; that if it was not made by that time, I do not think it should be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], has expired.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I want to say two or three things, if you please. Every bit of my time has been taken up on this one thing that does not amount to a hill of beans.

The organized beer or liquor interests are behind two of these deletions, I am sure, without intent on the part of our conferees or the committee. It is just as plain as the nose on your face that we are going to be short nearly 12,000,000 bushels in our international commitments, if we drop, as we have dropped in this conference report and under our bill, our commitment on grain and grain products. We are going to give them to the distillers, the brewers and to the makers of mixed feeds. The same thing is true of rice. We are not so utterly foolish as to have used any of these powers unwisely, in the sense of business propositions. What did we do when we committed to Cuba 3,800,000 bags of rice? We got ten times that much in our return commitments for sugar, and you could not have passed the bill you passed here for sugar control but for our exercise of this allocation of rice to Cuba. I know that only 1 percent of the world's rice is produced in this country, but such as we had gave we unto them, and we got ten times the value for the American table. But because the brewers wished that rice, for the manufacture of beer, the power to allocate rice has been omitted.

The same thing is true in several other matters that have been cut out. In fertilizer we get back in production abroad over ten times the value of that fertilizer here, and we cannot get sufficient nitrates in this country.

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

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

Mr. HOBBS. We are pathetically short of nitrates. We cannot get them here without the trading ability that this law has been giving us under these allocation powers.

On word more in closing. You are wiping out the general power which the President asked for, the power to act in the event of a sudden emergency declared by him to exist. In such a case, no matter how desperate the need, the President is now being denied the right to do anything. We do not begrudge a day of the mourning period that John L. Lewis has just declared. We all bow in sorrow, and real grief, with the members of his union and their friends in deploring the Illinois catastrophe. We are not saying one word against that, but we have here an illustration of the need of this general power which has been carried for years in this act and which I submit wholly without regard to this dividing aisle, we ought to be glad to continue. Suppose the coal strike which is threatened—not this mourning period, but a strike—should come; suppose something else of the kind comes, do you mean to tell me that you wish to deny to the President of the United States his expressed desire to have continued his power to save such situations? Of course you do not, all of us trust him. Yet this conference report kills that power. There are millions of tons of coal on the docks of New York today consigned overseas by private contracts. In the event of a coal strike we would need every ton for home consumption, to keep public utilities running, and to serve essential needs in a thousand lines, yet no one has any power to stop a single shipment.

Illustrations of the need of such a power might be multiplied, and, as you think on such possibilities, will be multiplied in your mind.

This conference report must be voted up or down. It cannot now be amended. But we can resolve that we will not let this mistake continue to haunt us with fear of the real dangers we can utterly rout by a simple bill restoring this one emergency power.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] states that the United States exports much less fertilizer than we import. I know that such information has been furnished Members of Congress. If such a situation obtained, it was in normal times. It does not obtain now in Mississippi insofar as Chilean nitrate or ammonium nitrate is concerned. Nor does not now obtain with respect to Canadian nitrates or cyanamid.

One-third of the ammonium nitrate available for Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley was allocated for export and for the Allied Nations by the Civilian Production Administration for the period July 1946 to June 30, 1947. There were no material amounts of Chilean nitrate imported the latter part of 1946, and there have been delays on account of strikes and inability to obtain ships in 1947. I am advised that about 550,000 tons of Chilean will be imported by June 30, 1947. At the same time, I am informed that the ammonium plants reactivated by the Army will produce for the first 6 or 8 months of 1947 approximately 600,000 tons of ammonium nitrate to be shipped overseas by the Army to the occupied countries. I am familiar with the situation in Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley. But little Canadian nitrates and cyanamid are being shipped into the Delta of Mississippi. The capacity for

ammonium nitrate of the TVA, Spencer, and Lion is around 45,000 tons a month. The Army's capacity is 65,000 tons a month. There has been much delay already in the importations of Chilean, and Canadian shipments are being canceled and delayed as stated. It is not an accurate picture, therefore, to say that so far as the Delta of Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley are concerned, exports are less than imports.

Under the bill as it passed the House, fertilizers were included, but section e, included in the Conference Report, obtained in the House bill. It is as follows:

(e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments: *Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

The commitments of the Secretary of State are one thing; allocations are another. The Civilian Production Administration undertook to make allocations of about 15,000 tons each from the three plants supplying the lower Mississippi Valley from January 1 to June 30, 1947, after one-third of their production from July 1946 to December 1946 had been allocated directly and indirectly for export.

The intent of Congress, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] has stated, is clear:

First. Fertilizer, including ammonium nitrate, could not be allocated unless it was being allocated on March 24, 1947.

Second. The Civilian Production Administration was allocating on March 24, 1947, and stated that the allocations to June 30, 1947, would be sufficient. The intent is that additional allocations cannot be made.

Third. The further intent is that no allocation can be made for delivery by a plant of fertilizer, including ammonium nitrate after June 30, 1947.

The Civilian Production Administration undertook to allocate to June 30, 1947, although the War Powers Act expired on March 31, 1947. The intent is that there can be no allocation for delivery or shipment after June 30, 1947.

All commitments by the State Department are conditioned upon the Department being able to obtain the materials and facilities. There is a universal shortage of fertilizer for all domestic purposes. I am sympathetic with the Allied Nations, but the allocations have been made for the Allied Nations. The Army is manufacturing for the occupied countries. Domestic growers are entitled to consideration, and inasmuch as allocations are not being made to domestic growers, they should not be made to foreign growers. Personally, I oppose the continuance of the allocation of fertilizer. I regret that the language of the House bill was not retained which excluded fertilizer, but I concur in the intent as expressed by Chairman SPRINGER that no allocation will be effective for export or delivery after June 30, 1947. The State Department will have the same privilege of obtaining fertilizer as American farmers. It is not fair to the American farmers to make allotments for foreign commitments when no allotments are made to domestic producers, with the result that many domestic producers today are without fertilizers, especially in the Mississippi Delta and the lower Mississippi valley, where only nitrogen can be used to advantage. Mixed fertilizers are not suitable to alluvial or Delta soils.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, with all due respect to the committee, with the one problem which is left open, in my opinion, and that is the question that is left on the matter of the extent of these allocations, as to time of delivery.

It has been made plain that the power to allocate ends on June 30. It is perfectly obvious to me that if we are going to say the power to allocate should end on June 30, the power to go beyond that date in the matter of delivery should end then also, and it is my interpretation that the power to deliver beyond June 30 should be limited to the same period; namely, that delivery under foreign commitments would have to be made prior to June 30, 1947. To hold otherwise would create a rather ridiculous situation which would not only be inconsistent with the will of Congress to terminate controls but would be absolutely contradictory to the express intent, for we are involved and concerned in the termination of controls over commodities which are scarce but which vitally affect the industry and the economy of this country in scarce items such as fats and oils and fertilizer.

So that there will be no misunderstanding in our vote upon this report and the limitations and termination of controls and the matter of delivery of commitments made, unless I hear to the contrary I will assume that the deliveries must be made under commitments by June 30 or such commitments will terminate.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my interest in the termination of these war powers is centered primarily in the field of strategic and critical materials for the national defense. I have just finished 8 years' service on a special committee dealing with those particular materials. The committee in charge of that matter now is under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. I trust that committee will go into this matter very carefully and critically with a view of conserving our strategic and critical materials.

I have some reason to be alarmed about the situation. I picked up an announcement of the Office of Temporary Controls of January 29 in which it was stated that they had authorized the licensing and exporting of 65,000 tons of tin plate and the article went on to say that this is in addition to 55,000 tons authorized in September and in addition to some other authorizations. At the same time we are down on our backs in the matter of tin and although I understand only about 1 percent of tin plate is tin, we are so totally unprepared for any national emergency in our supply of strategic materials and especially as to tin supply that I am shocked we would export any of it.

Although I am now serving on the Ways and Means Committee, and am no longer serving on the committee having jurisdiction over strategic materials, I am going to keep on watching this matter of a strategic materials stock pile in the interest of the national defense, and will go into that matter much more fully with the committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. I am not going to let the matter drop. I cannot conceive of a situation where America today can think that it has one pound of tin available for export; yet they have licensed the exportation of tin and have not made a move yet to acquire the stock pile of tin as provided in Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

As I stated, I have had 8 years of experience with this matter, starting with Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and culminating with Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. We have been talking for years about a stock pile of strategic materials, yet we still do not have a stock pile of tin and the officials operating under the War Powers Act are authorizing the export of tin plate. In my opinion, you cannot end their duties any too soon if that is the way they are going to fail to protect our national defense.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute, and may I say that I agree entirely with him. All of us will watch this matter of allocations and we will watch the matter of sending much-needed materials out of this country when we need them ourselves.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very much. I am seriously concerned about this conservation of our strategic materials. We are literally flat on our back, yet they are exporting tin. I cannot imagine exporting a pound of it. I feel that such exportation is a menace to our national safety, and the officials administering the war powers have overlooked the matter of protecting our Nation's security against war itself. Their record has not been such as to convince me that their authority should be extended longer than provided in this bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The reason they are exporting tin is that they can get a bigger price per ton for the tin exported than they can get in their own country. The gentleman will find that is the situation in relation to the exportation of tin if he will look behind the curtain.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am going to look behind the curtain on the matter

of tin and other strategic materials, and I commend the Committee on the Judiciary, and especially the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], for their good work on this legislation to end the war powers at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD just before the vote was taken on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2849, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve the economies effected by this bill. They are in keeping with and in continuation of, the program of economy which we followed in the last Congress in which we reduced practically every estimate submitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Of course, when the war ended many governmental agencies had to be discontinued. They could not be dispensed with the day hostilities ceased. We had been 5 years developing them. They comprised widely distributed organizations, controlled billions of dollars worth of assets, employed hundreds of thousands and could not be concluded overnight. They had to be liquidated, and sometimes the cost of liquidation, for the time being, was more expensive than their continuation and maintenance would have been.

But just as rapidly as we reached the point where they could be eliminated, we curtailed their activities, reduced their appropriations, and prepared as expeditiously as possible for final and complete liquidation.

Most of such agencies have now reached that stage, and the program of retrenchment and liquidation which we are following here is precisely the program initiated in the last Congress.

But it does not follow, necessarily, that a cut in appropriations, a reduction in estimates, is either a saving or an economy. In fact, there are conditions when decreased spending may ultimately involve additional expenditures.

Unfortunately, there are some instances of that character in this bill, instances in which apparent retrenchments eventually would result, not merely in failure to economize, but in some cases in an all-over increase in actual expenses of operation and liquidation.

While most of the estimates incorporated in this bill were largely matters of routine, merely deficiencies which must be taken care of at the end of the fiscal year, there were some interesting high lights both in the hearings and the bill itself.

Undoubtedly the most notable witness who appeared before the committee was President Hoover, who came before us on the item in which an appropriation of $300,000,000 was recommended for government and relief in occupied areas. I do not think I have been more impressed with the demeanor of a witness and with the knowledge of detail and comprehension of the issues involved exhibited by President Hoover. He was wholly impartial. He confined himself entirely to the merits of the proposition before the committee, and made one of the most effective presentations I think I have ever heard. I was particularly impressed not only with his convincing and conclusive statement in support of the appropriation of $300,000,000, and supplementary appropriations when they should become necessary, but also with his warm approval, and his unequivocal endorsement of the efficiency with which the funds for this purpose have been administered, and are now being administered, in the foreign countries which he visited.

There have been charges of waste, maladministration, and unwarranted diversion in the recent distribution of supplies and disbursements from this fund. President Hoover reiterated his approval of the handling of these supplies and funds and said that after a personal inspection he did not believe they could be better administered under the circumstances. I commend to all who may be interested in the efficient distribution of American supplies in these famine-stricken areas, the careful reading of ex-President Hoover's very illuminating testimony before the committee as reported in these hearings.

In that connection may I also express my appreciation of the endorsement by the chairman, the able and distinguished gentleman from New York, of the wise and effective administration of our international affairs by the Department of State. As he well said, we must make it plain to Stalin, and I might add, to all other European and Asiatic heads of state, that we insist on free elections in Poland and elsewhere and that we will resist further encroachment on Greece and Turkey and that we demand that the agreements heretofore entered into by them be adhered to meticulously.

America is the traditional friend of Poland and the Polish people. More than any other one man, ex-President Wilson was the determining factor in the rehabilitation and reestablishment of Poland following the First World War. And every American President since, including President Truman has championed a free people under a free government in a free Poland. President Truman, this month, in one of the most momentous pronouncements ever made in American history promulgating the "Truman Doctrine," announced to Stalin and the world our determination to support threatened nations against encroachment or infiltration of communism, either abroad or in our own country. I am glad to join with the chairman in approval of that policy.

President Hoover warmly endorsed the provision of American funds to be used in providing food for European children. He spoke especially of the permanent handicap, both physical and mental, resulting from a subnormal diet in childhood. And the Committee on Appropriations unanimously approved his recommendation and his concern for European childhood by recommending in this bill the appropriation of every dollar requested for the purpose.

President Hoover's diagnosis of the deleterious effects of a defective diet in adolescent years is amply corroborated by the Army reports on the large percentage of American youth who were found to be disqualified for Army service by disabilities resulting from deficient diet in childhood. While we are providing for a normal and healthy generation of European people through adequate diet would it be amiss if we at the same time and in the same bill provided for normal and healthy American men and women in the next generation? While we are voting food for European children why cannot we vote food for American children?

It is difficult to believe that this committee and this House would vote for food for the children of other lands and neglect to vote food for our own children. But that is the proposition before us in this bill. Although schools in every State in the Nation are closing their school-lunch programs this month due to failure of the Congress to provide a deficiency appropriation to sustain the program, there is no provision in this bill for the continuation of school lunches. There is a provision here of $300,000,000 for food for foreign children but none for American children. It is true that no estimate has been received for the item—due to the hostility against the program announced on this floor. But in view of the earnest representations made to us individually and collectively from every part of the country of the importance of continuing this program, a program which we led the American people to believe we expected to continue, it is much to be regretted

that this bill does not contain an appropriation of at least $15,000,000 to take care of the deficit in the school-lunch program.

I am certain the Members of the House have been appalled by the numerous instances in which it has been testified children come to school without breakfast, even those children who come from wealthy homes where through caprice the child has not eaten breakfast. There is an unbroken record of testimony to the effect that in every school in which this program has been followed—and it is now being extended to practically every part of the country—there has been an immediate improvement in physical health and mental alertness. Hungry children are handicapped in scholarship as well as in normal physical development.

I trust the House will be willing to add a small sum for continuation of the school-lunch program for the remainder of the fiscal year. To fail to provide for it in this bill—late as it is in the school year—will to that extent estop us from consideration of such a provision in the annual supply bill coming up next month.

Another very interesting witness who appeared before us was General Bradley. General Bradley was one of our outstanding commanders in the war, a man with an unsurpassed military record. He contributed in his particular field, as largely perhaps as any other one man to the winning of the war. His administration of the Veterans' Administration has been remarkably efficient in spite of many obstacles.

Of course, it is inevitable that the executive head of this vast agency should find himself the object of criticism from many quarters. It would be impossible to administer it to the satisfaction of everybody. There is criticism by some part of the membership of the Congress that he has spent too much. There is criticism on the part of some of the beneficiaries, on the other hand, that he has not spent enough. But no man could have steered a course so successfully between charges of waste and charges of neglected need; between the requirements which were urged on the one side and economies which were demanded on the other, as has General Bradley. Of course, all of us know General Bradley succeeded to this position very reluctantly. He did not want it. It was forced upon him. He finally took it with the understanding that he would hold it only 2 years. I was distressed to hear him say that so arduous have been the duties of the position and so great has been the pressure for unwarranted concessions, and so unfair the criticism, that he desires to be released at the first opportunity.

In this connection, I was impressed with an article that I read this morning by Marquis Childs, a commentator in one of the local papers. It was written in amusing vein. He said the situation had reached the point where no Government servant dared approach Congress these days except at the risk of his life, and that it was the prevailing custom to break a leg off the nearest committee table and beat the offender over the head on the apparent theory that all government is an iniquitous evil. Of course, that was a jocular fantasy, but it illustrates an idea which has gotten abroad through the country, an unfortunate idea unjustified by the situation, that we do not treat witnesses who come before us with courtesy. I am glad to deny that and say that all we seek of witnesses who come before us are facts. It is not a personal matter. All we want to know is what they can tell us on the merits of the proposition being considered by the committee. It is to be regretted that so unfortunate an impression has been disseminated—even in jest.

But we have been entirely too rigid in our efforts to achieve reasonable economy in the writing of the provisions in this bill providing for the Veterans' Administration. Speaking generally, we should realize at the beginning that the Veterans Administration is a rapidly growing and expanding activity. We were told when the Second World War obligations were first provided for that the activities of the Veterans' Administration would not reach their peak until about 1975 or 1980; that from this time on until that far distant peak of activity every year there would be more cases entitled to hospitalization and that every year there would be requirements for larger pensions, allocations, and benefits to which veterans and their dependents are entitled under the law. So we cannot always judge absolutely with arithmetical certainty just what the needs are. Under the circumstances, with so vital an issue involved, we should always see that no veteran suffers unnecessarily and that his convalescence is not retarded and that everything is done for him that his situation requires. That is one thing on which I think we are all agreed. That is the minimum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Insufficient provision has been made there to meet minimum requirements, in my opinion. There is the provision for school and training benefits, one of the most notable provisions of the GI bill. That is a responsibility which rests upon us with a seriousness that is equaled by few other responsibilities borne by the Congress and the Government. I do not think sufficient has been provided for it in this bill.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The training of veterans in agricultural lines has been very popular in the section of the State which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. CANNON. It is popular because it is justified both by the program and by its effect upon the country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is a wonderful program, and the veterans are eager and anxious to take advantage of it, but we find that funds are being curtailed to the point where these programs cannot be carried on any longer. Are we going to say here, under the slogan of economy, that we are not going to give these boys, who want to learn agriculture, who want to take advantage of these programs, an opportunity to avail themselves of a law which this Congress has passed? Is that what we mean by denying this appropriation in this deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the statement is made in the hearings that by arithmetical computation ample funds have been provided. But they do not comport with the testimony which we have from other authoritative sources. Those most familiar with the situation say it is insufficient.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have letters from men who are trying to carry out this program, and they tell me that they do not have the teaching force, they do not have the equipment, they do not have the facilities for taking care of the great number of applications that are pouring in. In other words, those veterans want to take this training. They say they cannot give it to them because there are not adequate funds available. If we had an adequate appropriation in this deficiency bill, that work would go on. That is what they tell me. I want to ask the gentleman if that is true.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly we should make provision sufficient to take care of the situation, under any circumstances, no matter how rapidly it may expand, rather than to be caught with insufficient funds and any veteran fail to receive what he is entitled to have under the law.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. When I say "some veterans," it is a great group of veterans in my section that are being denied this training, and I want to say there is quite a bit of resentment on the part of those veterans who want to take this training and make a better contribution to our economy. Now, did you go into that? Did you have testimony from over the country showing the need for this program?

Mr. CANNON. We had testimony from the Department, and all the testimony from the Department was to the effect that they needed the entire estimate for the readjustment fund.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. On what ground was this opposed in this deficiency bill? I would like to know.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, there is a great demand on the part of the country and the Congress for economy, and the danger is, as the gentleman has indicated, that in our zeal for economy we pare the cheese so close as to interfere with the adequate administration of the Veterans' Bureau and its obligations to the veteran.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Would you say it is economy to shut off medicine for a sick man or some man who was trying to recuperate? Do you call that economy?

Mr. CANNON. There is the possibility that such deep cuts instead of proving to be economies may involve additional expense and, incidentally, delay provision for the beneficiaries. Veterans are entitled to benefits under the law. If there is not sufficient money here it must be provided through deficiency appropriations. If such deficien-

cies develop after the 1948 funds become available, advancement will be made from the 1948 funds and a deficiency bill will be brought in later. If the deficiency develops before the 1948 funds are available a deficiency bill will have to be put through immediately. In either event nothing will have been gained by cutting the estimate in this bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. One other observation, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think the gentleman will recall here in this Congress during the days when these boys were giving their all for our country and for our defense that we said that these boys coming back were going to have whatever they needed, that we were not going to deny them anything. Is this the answer to these boys who come back asking for an opportunity to go to school and learn to be farmers?

Mr. CANNON. I trust the bill before it leaves the House, or at least before it is reported out of conference, will provide amply for the veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who has proven herself an unfailing friend of the veteran. I trust she still maintains that attitude on this appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman anticipate offering an amendment?

Mr. CANNON. I hope an amendment can be offered which will be agreeable to both sides of the House making certain that no veteran suffers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that there is no decrease in the matter of salaries with the exception of the public-relations service. Is that true?

Mr. CANNON. That is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And the cuts for the pensions of $200,000,000 and readjustment benefits $350,000,000 were put in because it was thought they were not needed at this moment. Is not that true?

Mr. CANNON. As I explained, the mathematical computations of the committee seem to indicate provision of ample funds, but evidence before the committee was to the contrary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe there would be no difficulty in getting an amendment correcting it if that be true.

Mr. CANNON. I trust we may have from the distinguished lady from Massachusetts the support which she has always contributed to all worthy veterans' legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that General Bradley has stated that he might get along with a million dollars less on binding and printing. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. We propose no change in that item.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand, but the gentleman knows that we must insist on the amount for compensation, pensions, and readjustment allowances.

Mr. CANNON. There are of course numbers of items throughout the bill—not merely in this particular section of the bill—in which I approve the amount reported out by the committee. Only on those which seem unquestionably inadequate would I propose any change.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Five hundred and fifty million dollars, then, is the sum of the two items on pensions and readjustment allowances.

Mr. CANNON. I had in mind the readjustment allowances. For example, there is one provision under this item which should be increased and which should have general endorsement. That is the revolving fund from which a veteran can borrow money in an emergency or to tide him over some particular need. A veteran may come in and borrow $100 from the fund. All of us realize that there are times when loans should be available in such emergencies. There is not a chance for the Government to lose a penny on this program because when we lend a veteran $100 from the fund we take $10 a month from the amounts due him from the Government until the fund is fully reimbursed. So far as I know, there have been no losses.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That has not been cut, I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The amount requested was not provided.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. I think the gentleman might be interested in knowing that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has approved a bill with an authorization for a larger amount for a revolving fund. There are too many disabled veterans unable to get their loans.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to hear that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They were not able to get a loan because of lack of funds.

Mr. CANNON. The gentlewoman always anticipates any legitimate need of the veterans.

There is another item which does not come directly under the Veterans' Bureau but which immediately concerns administration of the GI bill of rights. It has to do with the Bureau of Community Facilities.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, every college and university in the country is closing its doors to further enrollment because it no longer has facilities to take care of the veterans coming in under the GI bill of rights for training and education. There is not a school in the country, so far as I know, that is not sadly in need of these facilities for carrying out the provisions of the bill having to do with the training and education of its ex-servicemen. It may be that we are paying an extraordinary price, but the emergency is also extraordinary. Unless these boys can be cared for this year, their hopes in many instances, if not in most instances, will be dashed because unless the boy starts now he will be so late as to lose the full benefit of the law.

There is another failure in the bill to provide required funds necessary to pay the accrued salaries of Messrs. Lovett, Wilson, and Dodd as required under a decision of the Supreme Court. No one was more critical of these three men than I was. I appointed a special committee under the chairmanship of the very able and distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] to investigate the charges against them and after a complete and exhaustive investigation the undisputed evidence was that these men should be dismissed, and as they were not dismissed, the Congress declined to appropriate salaries for their services. However, unfortunately for our conception of the situation, the Supreme Court decided that they were entitled to their salaries.

There have been countries in which the decision of the ballot and the opinions of the courts, if not acceptable, precipitated a revolution. When they did not win an election they resorted to arms. When they did not like the decision of the court, they resorted to violence. But not so here in America. Here in the United States we are a law-abiding people. If we lose an election, we go along with the majority. That is the glory of our form of government. If the Supreme Court decides against us, as unpalatable as it may be, we bow in obedience to the decision of the greatest court on earth.

Now, I do not think these men should have been continued in their positions. I do not think they are entitled to salaries, but I cannot countenance a revolution against a decision of the Supreme Court. To do so is to flout the Constitution—an attempt to undermine the very foundations of the Government itself.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

This decision is rendered all the more significant in view of the decision of the House to deny an appropriation for the Warren salary. The refusal is an attempt to legislate out of office an employee of the executive branch of the Government by the refusal of money. No one has asserted more frequently or more emphatically on this floor the right of the Committee on Appropriations to deny appropriations, any appropriation, the right of the committee to refuse to appropriate for any purpose under any circumstances, but there is an implied limitation upon that right in the Constitution itself. To permit such action in effect annuls the separation of powers which the framers of the Constitution deemed essential to the maintenance of our American freedom. The Constitution establishes three branches of the Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Each has its appointed field, and neither shall encroach upon the prerogatives of the other. For us to legislate men out of office, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, could violate not only the decision of the Supreme Court; by denying salaries we could abolish the Supreme Court itself. If you can do that in a small office, an inconsequential position, you can do it in any office, not excepting

the office of the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that before this bill leaves the House, we will be able to modify it sufficiently to take care of those imperative needs, the restriction of which would involve not economy but in the end additional expense and loss to the Government.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Public Service Commission of Vermont has rendered several distinct and valuable services to the farm population of Vermont during the past 2 years. Not only have electric rate reductions during that 2-year period far exceeded those of any comparable period in the history of the commission, but in its rural electrification survey and program for the electrification of rural Vermont it has been instrumental in bringing electricity to thousands of Vermont farms for the first time.

This study has received high praise from many. The worth of this program was assessed by ex-Gov. Mortimer Proctor in his retiring message in January when he said:

> No more valuable service to the people of rural Vermont has ever been rendered by the public service commission than that to be found in this feature of its activities and the manner in which it has followed through with its program of rural electrification.

Moreover, in its publication, Electricity on a Vermont 25-Cow Farm, the Vermont commission made available to farm users of electricity in Vermont a charted course or blueprint which shows not only the relative cost of, but how the individual farmer can profit from, the planned use of what the commission describes as his most valuable, most economical, most profitable hired man, electricity.

The following statement by Fletcher Plumley, chairman of the Vermont Public Service Commission, describes the rural electrification study. It is followed by excerpts from the commission's report on the use of electricity on the farm:

A REPORT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN VERMONT

(By Fletcher Plumley, chairman, public service commission)

In 1945, a State-wide survey of rural electrification was completed by the Vermont Public Service Commission. The information gathered was the basis upon which the commission supplied the retail distributors of electricity in Vermont with a detailed and well-charted postwar rural line building program. Today only 2 years later, the private utilities, the municipals and cooperatives, having taken full advantage of this material and having followed the suggestions made by us, over 90 percent of all Vermont farms have electricity available to them; when our survey started, on the other hand, less than 75 percent of all farms had electricity available. We consider this progress.

Mr. Chairman, the high lights of this survey follow:

In the first place, the field data was gathered by having an engineer of the public service commission staff perambulate some 14,300 miles of Vermont highways and byways.

The then-existing electric lines with their approximate locations were plotted on individual town maps (scaled 2 inches to the mile). Each building outside of cities, villages or small settlements was given a number, the owner or tenant was identified and the building was classified either as a farm,[1] a farm tenement, a rural residence, a school, a summer home, or "other."

Our field data also showed whether the individual establishment was electrified and, if not, whether electricity was available to it. (Electricity was considered "available" if an existing line was within one-quarter of a mile of the buildings thereof.) Where the farm buildings were electrified, notation was so made; also indicated was the company, municipality or cooperative by whom service was being supplied. If not electrified, the logical source of electricity was noted.

Lines were thereupon drawn on the field maps as the field survey progressed, showing a possible location and source for new electric lines. The source of electric service was designated by a code number on a working data sheet for each building not electrified.

The basic data thereafter was compiled, analyzed, summarized and eventually shown in detail. (Biennial Report for 1945, pp. 32 to 45, inclusive.)

From this data and these maps it was possible for us then to show in detail, county by county and town by town:

1. The county or town.
2. The total number of farms therein.
3. The total number and percentage of farms electrified, those with electricity available, and those to which electricity was not available.
4. The total number and percentage of farms that we of the PSC believed should either have electric service or have it available.
5. The approximate miles of line that would be necessary for area coverage.
6. The total number of prospective users on these miles of line for each town, each county, and the State as a whole.

This is the first complete survey of this nature that has been made. It has already proved of inestimable value. We believe no such undertaking in Vermont has been done for less cost by so few with such beneficial results to so many. In the days of PWA, CWA, or whatever the short-lived Federal agency may have been called, many attempts were started for surveys with this objective in view. Several were begun in Vermont; they have reposed for many years somewhere in the graveyard of similar projects which died aborning—but which, with no concrete results attained, far exceeded the cost incurred by the PSC for this survey of ours, which has been of such great use and value.

Our data, when first compiled, disclosed that of the 21,872 farms in Vermont, some 14,970, or 68.8 percent, were electrified as of December 1944. In addition, 1,370 farms, or 6.3 percent of the total number of farms, were found to be located beside or within one-quarter of a mile of existing lines, the limit within which we considered electric service as being available when, as, and if the farmer might desire it.

On the basis of the complete data then assembled, our commission came to the conclusion that as soon as manpower and material restrictions imposed by the war were removed there should be prompt electrification of an additional 4,000 farms in the State. We then believed that we would then see 93 percent of Vermont farms either electrified or with electricity available. That was the goal we set in December 1944. Moreover, not only would 4,000 additional farms be served, but, at the same time, approximately 1,500 rural residences, summer homes, camps, and schools would have electric service made available to them. To do this, it was estimated, would require the construction of 1,762 miles of rural electric line, at a cost of over $2,000,000, to those called upon to build the lines.

It should be emphasized at this point, perhaps, that the commission does not actually build a half-mile of line, allocate the money, or supervise its construction. This is all done by the electric systems, when and where they please. We of the commission can point the way, suggest what should be done, and urge that it should be done; from there on it is largely[2] up to the individual utilities.

As far as we know, at this stage, few of the then existing 45 electric systems in Vermont either had definite postwar plans or had given such serious thought to rural electrification that a concise, constructive, or planned program of progress was projected.

We believed that if this picture we had drawn could be adequately presented to the utilities in the State, pointing out at the same time the benefits which would accrue to them and to the people of the State, they would be as anxious as we were to reach the objective set.

Representatives of each corporate and municipal electric system were thereupon asked to come to Montpelier in a group and, later, individually, to meet with us and to discuss the possible program we believed their utility could and should follow.

There had been prepared for each, not only the detail for their existing system and all probable extensions, total farms, and total prospective users but also the miles of line necessary for the construction of each individual extension in each town served by them and for their system as a whole. In other words, we had a detailed postwar rural electrification building program for each of them. This mass of data, mapped and analyzed, we placed in the hands of the utilities, the municipalities, the cooperatives, without charge to them and as a public service.

As a follow-up to these conferences and discussions, each utility was supplied with a form on which to report their plans to us, and, also, a suggested form to follow in reporting to us each extension as and when built and energized.

This latter form is still being used to report progress to us; it shows the town, the system, the individual farm owner's name, the PSC map number of his farm, the line mileage involved, the date energized, the classification or symbol change, if any (i. e., whether they would classify the property as a summer home, a rural residence, or what), and a freehand sketch showing the approximate location of the new line.

Our first summation period came in December of 1945, and even though a late start had been made in the spring of that year, we were able to report to the public that 422 miles of new electric line had been built and energized.

The second summation now shows that between January 1, 1945, and November 1, 1946, some 1,026 miles of new electric line were built and energized and that 385 additional miles under construction are expected to be energized by the end of December 1946. This results in a total of 1,411 miles in the last 2 years, 80 percent of the mileage we

[1] Our definition of a farm closely parallels the U. S. Census definition. Thus, considerable latitude is used. For our purposes, the complete electrification of rural Vermont was the goal; this meant and means availability of electricity to all establishments including those where even a small "farming operation" is being performed.

[2] Secs. 6452, 6453, 6454, and 6455 of the public laws of Vermont outline the procedure to be followed before the PSC by one who desires electric service but has been denied an extension by those to whom he has applied.

proposed in January 1945. Also, these 1,411 miles of new line mean substantial investments in rural electrification have been made by the utilities concerned.

In 1945 we said some 4,000 additional farms should have electric service; we also said—and I quote from our last biennial report—"When this is done, we will see 93 percent of Vermont farms electrified or with electricity available."

Today electricity already is available to 90 percent of all the farms in Vermont—not 90 percent of the best farms in the State, but 90 percent of all establishments which by any stretch of an enthusiast's imagination might be called farms.

Furthermore, we of the commission now expect, with the utilities of the State cooperating to the extent they have during the past 2 years, that by the end of the 1947 construction season 96 percent or 97 percent of all Vermont farms will have electricity available to them.

Vermont's record in rural electrification progress during the past 2 years has been outstanding. Area coverage is not just something to talk about here in Vermont; it has become an actuality.

Mr. Chairman, the publication of the commission, to which reference was earlier made, entitled "Electricity on a 25-Cow Farm in Vermont," is a source of information which should be in the hands of all farmers served by electricity, so I include it as a further extension of my remarks:

ELECTRICITY ON A 25-COW FARM IN VERMONT

(A publication of the Vermont Public Service Commission)

Electricity has now been made available to over 90 percent of Vermont farms. By the end of 1947 this percentage will have moved ever closer to complete coverage.

The Public Service Commission of Vermont is gratified to have played an important part in this undertaking so meaningful to Vermont and Vermonters.

We are aware, however, that in too many instances electricity-on-the-farm has been allowed to remain a sleeping giant whose strength has not been used even to partial advantage.

In this pamphlet, material is included which attempts to point the way: to suggest that this "sleeping giant" is your most valuable, most economical, most profitable "hired man" if you would but use him.

This past fall, the public service commission asked each utility in Vermont to furnish it with information concerning the monthly bills of and the electrical farm machinery used by three or four of its "top" farm customers. We found that there are farm operations in Vermont using as much as 34,000 kilowatt-hours per year, that there are many using over 10,000 kilowatt-hours per year, and that the uses to which electric power is being put are legion.

These uses as yet are above average, to be sure. It was to bring some average figures to public notice that we asked Ralph Bugbee, farm director for Central Vermont Public Service Corporation (the utility having the largest number of farm customers in Vermont), to submit to us, for use in our biennial report, the results of his study of electricity on the farm. The following letter was sent to us by Mr. Bugbee.

We believe this is a challenging, informative and suggestive study that should have attention and wide distribution. We hereby incorporate it in this separate pamphlet so that the information it contains may more readily become the subject of discussion and, perhaps, the basis for individual study and action.

FLETCHER PLUMLEY, *Chairman.*
CHARLES C. MORSE.
WM. F. SINCLAIR.

There is no purchased service available to the farmer which lends itself in so many ways to the efficiency of the farm and the farm home as does electricity. Electricity is also the only purchased service which has declined in price during these past years when everything else has been increasing.

An electric utility is a mass-production business on which there is a very small profit per unit. In such a business both the customer and the utility should benefit if both play their part. When the farmer increases his use of electricity, he increases the gross profit of the utility. The utility in turn passes back part of its increased earnings in reduced costs of electricity and makes investment in improved equipment and service from which the customer benefits. As proof that this policy is working, I wish to point out that in 11 years from 1935 through 1946 the average kilowatt-hour use per farm on the system of the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation has increased from an average of about 1,000 kilowatt-hours to over 2,300—230 percent. During this period the company has put into effect four rate reductions and has improved its plant and equipment to a marked degree. In addition to the four general rate reductions, the low rates of the company have been made available to about 2,900 customers acquired by the purchase of other electric companies. The average cost of a kilowatt-hour to the farmer served by this company is at least 30 percent less than it was 10 years ago.

We have heard it said that the farm-electric bill is steadily going up. It is, but the ratio between cost per unit and what the farmer gets for his total bill is interesting. For instance in this company a farmer who uses 100 kilowatt-hours per month pays an average of 4.38 cents per kilowatt-hour, if he uses 250 they cost him 3.03 cents, and if he increases his use to 500 they drop to 2.51 cents. Looking at it another way his total cost has increased two and eight-tenths times but for that increase he has received five times as much electricity.

The Central Vermont Public Service Corp. believes that it is not unreasonable to expect that within a few years the average farm on its system will be using at least 6,000 kilowatt-hours per year. To accomplish this the company has a farm department of five trained men to consult with its farm customers and give them sound advice upon electrical applications. When the farmer knows how to use electricity, he soon realizes it is profitable and applies it to more and more of his farm operations with benefit to both the farmer and the utility. The company too will presently be serving considerably more than 90 percent of all the possible customers in its territory. It will have over 3,000 miles of rural lines or enough to reach from New York to San Francisco.

In support of our very real belief that liberal electrical installations on the farm are economically sound and financially profitable, the following statistics are presented for an average dairy farm of 25 cows and a small flock of hens. Figures of this type can always be questioned but there are on file many actual case histories, lists of equipment, and check meter tests which are even more convincing.

It is true that a reasonably complete list of electrical equipment for the farm and the home represents considerable money, but this cost compares favorably with other items of equipment that cost nearly as much for one item alone and whose use is limited to a very small part of the year. Electrical equipment is unquestionably more free from operation troubles and has a much longer productive life.

With the trend of labor away from the farm, a probable reduction in the financial return from farm products, and with an increase in the cost of all services—except electric—which farmers have to buy, there is a tremendous opportunity for Vermont utilities to render a real service to the State by making electricity available to all areas and especially by showing their customers, both farm or urban, how to make the very best use of it.

Yearly average current consumption of electrical equipment and equipment depreciation on an average Vermont 25-cow dairy farm with a poultry flock of 500 hens

	Kilowatt-hours per year	Equipment cost (dollars)	Life (years)	Depreciation	
				Percent	Dollars
FARM USE					
Lights	240	50	20	5	2.50
Milking machine (2 kilowatt-hours per cow per month)	600	250	10	10	25.00
Milk cooler (25 kilowatt-hours per can per month for 7 months cooling both night and morning, average 6 cans per day)	1,050	330	10	10	33.00
Dairy water heater (8 gallons twice a day)	1,800	65	10	10	6.50
Barn ventilator (check meter tests 7 months)	630	150	10	10	15.00
Clippers	25	22	10	10	2.20
Small utility motor, ½ horsepower, to do the following work: Concrete mixer, separator, churn, emery wheel, grindstone, drill press, portable elevator, ice-cream freezer, lathe, sprayer	60	20	20	5	1.00
Large power motor, 5 to 7½ horsepower, to do the following work: Wood saw, bench saw, feed grinder, silo filling, hay hoist	600	200	20	5	10.00
Soil cable (2-sash hotbed, 75 kilowatt-hours per sash per season of 2 months)	300	15	10	10	1.50
Water-pipe protection (120 feet of cable and control, operating one-fourth of time, 800 watts, 5 months)	1,000	15	10	10	1.50
Radio (100 watts, 2 hours per day)	73	25	5	20	5.00
Water pump (pump only) (25 gallons per day for 25 cows, 2 horses, 12 young stock, etc.: 1,000 gallons for 1 kilowatt-hour)	360	125	20	5	6.25
Brooder (2 broods of 300 chicks, ½ kilowatt-hour per chick)	300	35	10	10	3.50
Total for farm	7,038	1,302			112.95
HOME USE					
Lights (fixtures only)	240	100.00	20	5	5.00
Washer (wringer type)	48	100.00	20	5	5.00
Refrigerator (8-foot)	360	175.00	10	10	17.50
Range (8,000 customers, average 100 kilowatt-hours per month, farmers use slightly more)	1,500	150.00	20	5	7.50
Toaster (good one)	48	17.50	10	10	1.75
Percolator	48	5.00	10	10	.50
Vacuum cleaner	12	50.00	20	5	2.50
Mixer beater	48	30.00	10	10	3.00
Radio (100 watts, 6 hours per day)	219	50.00	5	20	10.00
Waffle iron	48	5.00	10	10	.50
Heating pad	12	4.00	5	20	.80
Flat iron	72	10.00	10	10	1.00
Ironer	144	100.00	10	10	10.00
Water pump (barn system supplies house, 25 gallons per person per day)	6				
Total for home	2,568	796.50			65.05

Total kilowatt hours for both farm and home	9,606
Average kilowatt hours per month	800
Average monthly kilowatt-hour cost	$18.58
Total kilowatt-hour cost for year	$222.96
Total depreciation for year	178.00
Total cost for year	400.96

Now let us see if this yearly average expense of $400.96 can be justified from an efficiency and economy point of view. Many small farmers say that electrical equipment, especially milkers, coolers, and water pumps

alone make it possible to eliminate one hired man. At present wage scales the cash-wage payment alone exclusive of the usual prerequisites is more than twice the yearly bill. Each farmer can best analyze his particular operation by making a study of what it would cost him to do by some other method the work electricity is doing for him taking into consideration not only the dollar cost of operation but the convenience, safety, and versatile nature of the service.

We believe the following figures are conservative:

Yearly savings made possible by use of certain electrical equipment

Lights, 7 months half hour per day at 50 cents per hour	$52.50
Milker 12 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	182.50
Cooler 7 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	182.50
Water heater 12 months one-quarter hour per day at 50 cents per hour	45.62
Utility motor 12 months one-half hour per day at 50 cents per hour	52.50
Soil cable 5 months one-half hour per day at 50 cents per hour	18.75
Brooder 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	10.25
Water pump 12 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour	182.50
Ventilator—saving in health of cattle, depreciation of building, saving in moldy hay, veterinarian, etc. Estimated at least	50.00
Power motor—saving in labor, time, gas, and oil, wear and tear on machinery at least	50.00
Home—put your own figure on the value of this service to your wife and family and to the better home you can have	(?)
Total savings	827.12

To effect this saving of $827.12 per year, it costs $400.90 for electric current and depreciation. This leaves $426.16 as a return on the investment of $2,098.50 in electrical equipment. This is better than 20 percent.

We have purposely omitted the investment in a wiring system because it is such a varying figure. Three hundred dollars should put in one of the best, and when properly done it is good for a lifetime. An adequate and properly installed wiring system is essential for proper and economical operation of equipment, and is without question the safest source of light, heat, and power.

In addition to the items of electrical equipment mentioned above which are commonly accepted today on the reasonably well-equipped farm, there are others that are rapidly coming into use and which will eliminate still further much of the hardest farm labor. Some of these are the barn-hay finisher, farm and home food freezers, barn cleaners, home water heaters, dishwashers, electrically controlled central heating systems, and many small items to take the drudgery out of life.

We repeat that the liberal use of electricity under the trained supervision of utility personnel and extension service can and will make farm life in Vermont even more attractive than it is today.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

PROPAGANDA AGAINST ECONOMY

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill carries appropriations aggregating more than $2,400,000,000. It represents a reduction in budget estimates of more than $628,000,000.

It is to be hoped that those who are determined to oppose all reductions in Federal expenditure will in this instance obtain the facts before resorting to unjustified discharge of personnel and indulging in false propaganda such as we have recently witnessed.

The well-known practice of applying cuts to personnel in the lower brackets, as distinguished from those in the upper brackets, and to activities which are obviously important and popular as distinguished from those which are unimportant or unessential is contrary to the national interest and must cease.

It is perfectly evident that an organized campaign is being conducted against every effort to bring economy into the Federal Government in spite of the clear mandate from the people last November.

Of course, the bureaucrats with vested interests in their jobs are opposed to economy. Of course, the New Dealers who cling to the philosophy of "spend and spend, tax and tax" are opposed to economy. Of course, the Communists and fellow travelers who would destroy free enterprise in this country are opposed to economy.

No doubt they will all work together by propaganda, or otherwise, to continue the spending policies of recent years which have brought this country face to face with the most menacing financial picture in its history.

The most flagrant example of the point of view of those sponsoring this organized propaganda campaign is afforded by their recent action in respect to the House appropriation for the customs service in the next fiscal year.

This service asked for an increase of $6,500,000 over their appropriation for the present fiscal year. The House approved an increase of $3,165,000 over their appropriation for the present fiscal year. Yet, because the full increase requested was not granted for the fiscal year 1948, the head of the customs service actually went so far as to send dismissal notices, effective immediately in the fiscal year 1947, to some two thousand border and port patrol agents while fantastic stories were circulated to the effect that our borders and ports were, as a result of congressional action, wide open to smugglers.

This is just an example of the propaganda campaign emanating from the administration by which those in the Congress who seek to carry out the will of the people are confronted at this time.

I am confident that the American people will ultimately recognize the sources of this campaign. I am confident that they will ultimately appraise the campaign at its proper value. I am confident that they will continue to insist on the elimination of all waste and extravagance in the Federal Government.

A topheavy bureaucracy does not help the veteran, the wage earner, the farmer, or the people generally. All waste and inefficiency in Government simply increases the bill that all must pay.

The problem of putting our financial house in order is the most important domestic problem in America today. Failure to take the steps essential to this end can easily result in national calamity and untold suffering for all.

ANTIDEFICIENCY LAW

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to the so-called antideficiency law.

I call attention to the fact that your committee has been confronted by repeated violations of the spirit if not the letter of this law. There are in this deficiency bill some six or seven examples where in my judgment the spirit if not the letter of the law has been violated.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD the provisions of the law appearing in title 31 of the United States Code.

TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE

No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than one month. (R. S. 3679; March 3, 1905, ch. 1484, sec. 4, 33 Stat. 1257; February 27, 1906, ch. 510, sec. 3, 34 Stat. 48.)

We are all familiar with its provisions in a general way, I think. We know that it provides, among other things, that no department shall employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

We know also that it provides that all appropriations shall, on or before the

beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made.

We know also that the penalty for violation of the act is summary removal from office together with fine or imprisonment.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the provisions of this act, your committee has been confronted again and again by agency after agency, often with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but without one word to the Congress, by the actual employment of additional personnel, compelling the Congress either to approve additional funds for the fiscal year in question or to discontinue essential activities.

This practice, Mr. Chairman, must be ended.

One example in this bill is perhaps sufficient. I refer to the Veterans' Administration.

In 1940 there were some 38,000 people on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration. When General Bradley took over in the summer of 1945 there were some 64,000 people on the rolls. A year ago when this House approved the 1947 appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, it was approved on the basis of 143,588 persons on the rolls. In February of this year, General Bradley came before our committee and told us that he had no less than 204,654 people on the rolls. As a matter of fact, after examination it turned out to be not 204,654, but 224,852 people, and that did not include various employees who are not carried on the regular pay roll, which brought the over-all figure up to about 232,000 persons on the rolls.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we were confronted in February with an increase of 80,000 persons on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration at a probable annual cost of something like $240,000,000 without one word having been said to the Congress prior to the employment of any one of them.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pick out any one agency. We all appreciate the tremendous problem that General Bradley has had. We all want to see a 100 percent job done for all our veterans. As a matter of fact, your committee has allowed, with a minor exception, the entire request for personnel for the balance of the year, subject to reconsideration in connection with 1948 funds.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, if the Congress is to exercise control over appropriations, it is manifest that the anti-deficiency law must be complied with.

Regardless of the merits or demerits, in this particular instance, of the increase in personnel, it is clear that a 60 percent increase in personnel without one word to the Congress cannot be justified.

REDUCTIONS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS

Now, as far as appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are concerned, we have already made available $6,356,000,000. In this bill a further appropriation to the extent of $2,003,000,000 was requested.

I may say that that request has been allowed in full except for two substantial reductions, the result of recalculation on the basis of recent rates of spending, largely concurred in by General Bradley; and two or three minor items of reduction, including a reduction in the number of those engaged in public relations work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Am I correct in understanding that this money is not given now for the pensions and readjustments, but will be given in a later bill? In other words, it is just a matter of bookkeeping whether you do it now or later, because if the money is due the veterans by law, of course we will pay them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course, when pensions are due, they will be paid in full. Of course, when readjustment allowances are due, they will be paid in full. The reductions here have been made because on the basis of the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration, more money was asked for than is required at this time.

For example, take the matter of pensions. The figures furnished your committee show that in the first 7 months of the year about $1,068,000,000 was actually expended. The rate of expenditure in December was $168,000,000; in January $171,000,000.

Your committee allowed $180,000,000 for each of the last 5 months of the year, and, in addition, a sum of $172,000,000, which was expended in the fiscal year 1946.

Adding those three figures together gives a total of about $2,140,000,000 needed as compared with about $2,346,000,000 requested, giving an indicated cut of $200,000,000, in which General Bradley appears to concur, as the lady from Massachusetts will note if she will refer to page 631 of the hearings before the committee.

Now let us look for a moment at the figures furnished in reference to readjustment allowances. This item breaks down into three subdivisions.

First, there is the request for loan-guarantee work, which General Bradley and the Bureau of the Budget indicated could be reduced by $27,900,000. Your committee followed this recommendation.

Second, there is the request for education and training; and, third, the request for readjustment allowances.

For the first 7 months the Veterans' Administration figures indicate that there was spent for education and training $1,272,000,000, an average of $181,000,000 a month. Your committee allowed $200,000,000 for each of the last 5 months, or a total of $1,000,000,000. Adding that to the amount spent in the first 7 months gives a total of $2,272,000,000 needed as compared with $2,441,000,000 asked, indicating a possible reduction of $170,000,000 in respect to education and training.

Figures furnished by the Veterans' Administration for readjustment allowances indicate that $995,000,000 was spent in the first 7 months. Adding $550,000,000 to that figure which allows $110,000,000 for each of the last 5 months, an amount well in excess of the January expenditure, gives a total of $1,505,000,000 needed as against $1,850,000,000 requested, indicating a possible cut of $345,000,000, in which General Bradley appears to concur, as the lady from Massachusetts will see by referring to page 638 of the committee hearings.

As a matter of fact, the committee did not cut the combined item the indicated $515,000,000—$170,000,000 plus $345,000,000. It reduced the combined figure by $350,000,000, leaving what appears to be a cushion of $165,000,000 over and above that which is required.

I repeat that with the exception of these two reductions made on the basis of Veterans' Administration figures indicating that the money requested is not needed at this time, and two or three other minor reductions the Veterans' Administration has been allowed every cent that it has requested.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield again briefly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that General Bradley made an error in asking for the amount? It would seem so because he apparently agrees that it is not needed. I am very much troubled about it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. From the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration it appears that someone overestimated present needs. The committee has made reductions to offset that overestimate on the basis of the Veterans' Administration's own figures.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And it is satisfactory to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have referred the lady from Massachusetts to two citations in the committee hearings which seem to indicate that General Bradley is largely in accord with the reductions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time, and I shall condense as much as I can the remainder of what I intended to say.

RELIEF IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

The chairman has referred to the item for relief in occupied areas amounting to $300,000,000 on top of the $425,000,000 already appropriated.

The reasons given for the supplemental request are: First, increase in food costs; second, displaced persons to the number of 620,000 in Germany and Austria; third, the taking over of the Ryukyu Islands from the Navy; fourth, the termination of UNRRA work in Austria on December 31, last; and fifth, an extra appropriation for Korea for economic rehabilitation.

The general objective is the increase in the calories per day to be made available in these countries, help to be provided until these countries are on a self-sufficient basis.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD a table giving a break-down of the requested $300,000,000, first by country and second by commodity:

Supplemental estimate, fiscal year 1947, Government relief in occupied areas

[By project and area]

Subject No.	Purpose of project	Austria, United States zone, cost	Germany, United States zone, cost	Japan, cost	Korea, United States zone, cost	Italy, cost	Total
110	Purchase of grain, food, and kindred products	$13,662,557	$46,607,013	$111,975,563	$41,074,000		$213,319,433
130	Purchase of petroleum and petroleum products	960,050	4,173,350	8,823,765	2,291,566	$50,224	16,298,955
140	Purchase of textiles	1,097,534	3,953,715				5,051,249
160	Purchase of other supplies and equipment	718,789	4,695,711		10,000,000		15,414,500
421	Commercial ocean transportation	2,117,445	6,982,512	18,780,969	13,727,486	24,273	41,632,685
423	Transportation of civilian supplies (rail)		1,465,838	4,616,551	1,550,789		7,633,178
430	Incidental operating expenses			650,000			650,000
	Total	18,556,675	67,878,139	144,846,848	68,643,841	74,497	300,000,000

You will notice that about $67,000,000 is to go to Germany, $18,000,000 to Austria, $144,000,000 to Japan, $68,000,000 to Korea, and a small amount to Italy.

If we add the sums already provided for these countries under the $425,000,000 appropriation we shall find that Germany will receive, all told, about $216,000,000, Austria $22,000,000, Italy $16,000,000, Japan $330,000,000, and Korea $138,000,000.

I call attention to the fact that the amount involved for ocean transportation is extremely high. It amounts to almost $15 a metric ton.

Former President Hoover has suggested that perhaps $90,000,000 might be saved in the next fiscal year if some of our Liberty ships were used for carrying the relief commodities.

As the chairman has pointed out, it appears that a reduction of $38,000,000 might be made in this over-all item. The committee has preferred, however, to make the whole amount available on the understanding that the pipe line will carry on until September or October on that basis, and afford the committee a further opportunity for detailed consideration of the request for 1948 in connection with the War Department appropriation bill.

FOREIGN FINANCING SINCE WAR

Mr. Chairman, for my part I think it is manifest that much of the financing in other countries that we are being called upon to do, is essential if from no other point of view than that of national self-interest.

The difficulty that I find in the matter is the difficulty of knowing where to draw the line.

I think that difficulty has been tremendously increased by the fact that the administration has never put all the cards on the table nor given the Congress a complete, over-all program. It has been fed to us piece by piece and it has been our problem to try to put the picture puzzle together.

I have tried in this instance to obtain something of an over-all picture as to the period since the ending of the war. You will find the results of that attempt included on pages 897 to 910 of the committee hearings.

Briefly, the information furnished seems to indicate that since the ending of the war in one form or another we have made available over $14,000,000,000 and that we have given further authorizations of over $7,000,000,000 or a grand total of over $21,000,000,000.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD a brief table which summarizes the information that Assistant Secretary Clayton furnished the committee in this connection:

UNO and certain other international organizations	$29,289,349
International Bank (total obligations, $3,175,000,000)	635,000,000
International fund	2,750,000,000
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
Occupied territories	802,034,187
Liberation territories	969,892,106
Lend-lease credits (since VJ-day)	1,402,000,000
Lend-lease aid post VJ-day (China and Italy)	761,000,000
Surplus property credits	1,148,000,000
Loan to United Kingdom (total obligations, $3,750,000,000)	600,000,000
Grants to Philippine Islands ($20,000,000 loans also authorized)	620,000,000
Export-Import Banks (loans disbursed)	1,592,207,176
Total	14,009,422,818
Further authorizations:	
International Bank	2,540,000,000
Loan to United Kingdom	3,150,000,000
Loan to the Philippine Islands	20,000,000
Export-Import Bank	1,339,000,000
Total	21,058,422,818

May I point out in closing that it appears from the RECORD that approximately $3,700,000,000 have been made available for UNRRA and of that Uncle Sam has contributed about $2,700,000,000.

There is available for expenditure in the calendar year 1947 some $600,000,000 and of this same $305,000,000 contributed by this country is planned for expenditure after the 1st of July next—in other words, in the fiscal year 1948.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, included in this $600,000,000 for distribution in the calendar year 1947 is over $243,000,000 for China, over $34,000,000 for Austria, over $21,000,000 for Greece and over $194,000,000 for seven Russian satellite countries.

I mention this in closing Mr. Chairman because it seems to me that unless General Marshall is able to obtain results at Moscow a very definite question presents itself as to whether these supplies should be allowed to go forward to the satellite countries to which I have referred.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill, you will notice on page 11, at the bottom of the page, these words:

JUDGMENTS

House Document 131, submitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, included judgments in favor of Goodwin B. Watson, $101.78; William E. Dodd, Jr., $59.83; and Robert Morss Lovett, $1,996.40. These judgments resulted from action in the courts to recover compensation for periods of service after November 15, 1943, the effective date of an act of Congress forbidding the employment of such persons unless appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The committee has denied the requested appropriation to pay the judgments.

The decision of the Court of Claims, speaking through the Chief Justice, concludes with these words:

In view of the conclusions arrived at it is immaterial whether section 304 of the Urgency Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 or any part thereof is unconstitutional or not. We do not decide that question. The plaintiffs are entitled to recover in either event.

Then it goes on to say that Robert Morss Lovett is entitled to recover $1,996.40, the same amount certified by the Budget, the Treasury, and the President; Goodwin B. Watson is entitled to recover $101.78; and William E. Dodd, Jr., is entitled to recover $59.83:

The judgments will be entered accordingly. It is so ordered.

That is the conclusion of the Court of Claims. The Supreme Court decision concludes as follows:

When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishments were too dangerous to liberty to exist in a nation of freemen they envisioned, and so they proscribed bills of attainder. Section 304 is one. Much as we regret to declare an act of Congress violates the Constitution, we have no alternative here.

Section 304, therefore, does not stand as an obstacle to payment of compensation to Lovett, Watson, and Dodd. The judgment in their favor is affirmed.

I have no desire to quarrel with anyone who disagrees with the position I feel compelled to take in this matter, but I have always had the belief, yea, more than the belief, the conviction, that the purpose of the Appropriations Committee, its chief function, was to implement the will of Congress and to perform the duty lawfully assigned to it by Congress as interpreted by the courts. When, therefore, Congress enacts a piece of legislation and the Supreme Court affirms judgments of the Court of Claims to the effect that whether that enactment is constitutional or not, the money decreed by those judgments must be paid. I maintain no Member, nor committee, nor body of Congress has any right to defy the law so declared. Especially is that true in the Lovett, Dodd, and Watson cases, wherein the Supreme Court not only affirmed the judgments of the court of claims, but also went further and declared that the enactment by Congress which sought to prevent payment of their salaries was a bill of attainder, and hence utterly null and void because unconstitutional. So, in those cases it is too clear for doubt that it is the manifest duty of all who would observe the law of the land to bow to that mandate.

Unless, then, we hold ourselves above the law, we must provide the funds needed to satisfy these judgments.

I am not here to try to lecture anybody. I am not here blaming anybody. I am simply rising for a point of information which I desire fervently. I listened to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee in his statement today that he could not conscientiously vote to pay these judgments. I honor him as I do few men in this House for his integrity and for his high character in every respect, but I submit that his statement does not satisfy me as an answer, and I would love to ask the gentleman to point out what he relies on to justify his position.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice of this Congress in the past when unconscionable judgments were rendered by courts to refuse to pay them. There are precedents of that character. This is an unconscionable judgment. These three men beyond dispute did not owe their first loyalty to the Government of the United States. When the Court refused to pay attention to the law which the Congress wrote, and when it by virtue of an assumed power attempted to declare that provision of law unconstitutional, I felt that the operation had such an odor that I could not conscientiously be a party to bringing in an appropriation to meet it. Under the Constitution, the direct power to make appropriations, whether to satisfy judgments or otherwise, is exclusively in the Congress, and I feel that we have that responsibility.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for amplifying his answer and I appreciate his answer. Of course, I agree with the gentleman that the power to appropriate is not only in Congress but particularly in this House, and, more especially, in the great committee of which the gentleman happens to be the honored and able chairman at this time. But his answer amounts to nothing more than that he so violently disagrees with the courts that have decided against his contention he will do what he pleases, without regard to the law as declared by the authorities to which that duty has been committed, and seeks to excuse his conduct because it has been done before.

Of course, the legislative branch of our Government has the power of the purse. But that great power, as every other power in a government of law, not of men, may only be exercised within the law and in accord with the law.

Does not your theory lead to the destruction of our form of government, which the Constitution prescribes should be administered by three coordinate branches, free and independent of each other?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I think there are many among my colleagues of the House who have seen a far-stretching graveyard of a great forest, and who have realized the terrible loss to mankind. Irreplaceable destruction has been caused by forest fires. But today we have in the Pacific Northwest another, and not less potent, killer of trees—the tussock moth. This insect has ravaged thousands of acres of valuable timber in the primitive and beautiful mountains of northern Idaho.

Just east of the heavily wheat and pea productive Palouse farming section, stretching across from eastern Washington, I take you to the edge of the immense evergreen forests of the Idaho Panhandle. Here in this border area, between farm and forest, during the summer of 1945, it was noticed that some destructive agent was attacking scattered areas of fir trees. Then it was recalled that in 1944 a few trees had turned brown and died. There was no pronounced public uneasiness, although a few owners sprayed or cut down and burned dying farmhouse shade trees. But in the summer of 1946, the damage quickly spread to an alarming extent. Whole hillsides of heavy timber now turned yellow as though touched by a searing blast, and great patches appeared in State and Federal forests, reaching out into stands of merchantable timber. Public meetings were held. Experts from the Forest Insect Division of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine and the Forest Service men assigned to the region, who had been checking on the outbreak, reported that the Douglas fir tussock moth was responsible for the damage.

The Tussock moth is a small insect which basically attacks Douglas fir and white fir, but feeds on other tree species associated with firs when food is scarce. The injury is done by the larva of the moth. The young caterpillars hatch in late May and feed on the foliage, killing the tree by defoliation. They are active and travel in search of food and the infestation is most widely spread by these tiny, newly hatched caterpillars. These are covered with hairs, spin little silken threads after coming out of the egg, and are blown by the wind to other trees for considerable distances. While the rate of increase is tremendous, there is fortunately but a single generation each year, and the damage is done only in the period of about 30 days before the caterpillar changes to a moth.

About 350,000 acres are now covered by the infestation in Latah, Benewah, and Clearwater counties. This includes Federal, State, county, and privately owned land. With the wartime development of new insecticides, particularly DDT, and the fact that small quantities are effective, spraying can be done by airplanes. Such a program has been tried out successfully on a much smaller scale against the gypsy moth in New York and Pennsylvania. Obviously, the aerial spraying must cover the whole area, and there is no way to stop it exactly along the boundary of the various owners. It is peculiarily a project for cooperative effort. The legislature of Idaho this last month appropriated $210,000 for its share of the work. The private timber owners, including lumber companies, who form the Potlatch Timber Protective Association, have voted to assess themselves $68,000 for their share. Private owners of small forest plots have agreed to put up 42½ cents per acre for the aerial spraying.

The Federal Government is particularly concerned in stamping out the infestation because the untouched area to the east, and in the path of the prevailing winds is heavily timbered national forest. There is an immediate prospect of the loss of millions of dollars of lumber values. This lumber cannot be spared at any time, and certainly not now, in the face of our acute building shortage.

But the commercial timber is only a part of the loss. Large areas of dead trees mean a greatly increased fire hazard. Farm woodlots of smaller private owners will continue to die if the center of infestation is not cleaned out. As grave as all else is the threat to our watersheds and, not the least, the destruction of the scenic beauty of one of the loveliest parts of the primitive forests of Idaho.

That is why I urged upon the committee, and now urge upon you the necessity for this item in the deficiency bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to this bill as an economy move. I will say to the gentleman, on the record the bill hardly stands up as an economy measure. Of the $628,139,491 the committee has cut from the budget estimate, $551,020,000 is being taken from the Veterans' Administration—and that is the part of this bill I want to talk about now.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the action taken by the committee in reducing the current deficiency appropriation of the Veterans' Administration is sheer folly. This action does not contribute to economy. Rather, the action taken by the committee contributes only to the growing confusion facing our administrative agencies as a result of bungling of appropriations.

Hearings on the current Veterans' Administration deficiency appropriations were held for the first time on February 13, of this year. It has taken since February 13 to get this measure to the floor. I point this out because, due to the committee's action—if it is upheld—it will be necessary to act on another deficiency appropriation for the Veterans' Administration before this session of Congress adjourns.

The bill as reported by the committee reduces pensions in the amount of $200,000,000. It also reduces by $350,000,000 funds with which to take care of direct benefits under the GI bill of rights. These are not savings. This action by the committee will merely make it necessary that another deficiency appropriation be considered at a later date.

This action cannot be a saving because the purpose for which the original budget estimate was requested is provided for under existing law—and under law the Government is committed to make these expenditudes to our war veterans.

At the present rate that this bill is progressing, it cannot conceivably become law before April 10. Therefore, in order that the GI benefits and the pensions of our veterans be paid for the remainder of the fiscal year, it will be necessary for the Veterans' Administration to request another deficiency appropriation on April 15 in order to obtain action on its request before the adjournment of this session of Congress.

It seems to me ridiculous that we are taking this action. Certainly we are not saving money. Certainly, we are not saving the time and efforts of the committee nor of the House. In my estimation the only thing that is accomplished by this bill is that it will provide a false basis for claims of economy by the Republican Members of this House.

The money that is requested in the original budget submitted by the Veterans' Administration for these pensions and direct benefits must eventually be paid. In my opinion the House should promptly meet the full estimate for 1947 pensions and readjustment benefits in order that we may know exactly where we stand in matters affecting the national budget.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the contentions of the gentleman who have preceded me, I think I should call attention to certain testimony of the officials of the Veterans' Administration.

I hold in my hand the hearings on this bill. At page 638 of the testimony dealing with the readjustment benefits, the record reads as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. In January a little under $90,000,000; with $15,000,000 it would be $105,000,000. If you call it $110,000,000 you would be getting to pretty near a stable average, would you not? It ought not to run over $110,000,000.

General BRADLEY. Under present conditions that ought to be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. On that basis $550,000,000 ought to take care of the last 5 months, which would make about $1,505,000,000 for the year. This was 7 months. The first 6 months was $955,000,000. So that $550,000,000 would cover your requirements for the way the thing looks now.

Mr. MOORE. That would be that one particular phase.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am asking you about?

General BRADLEY. We think that will. You see the figures I gave you a minute ago on which the estimates were based were made up last fall, and we anticipated about $1,250,000 average and now we are getting only about $1,150,000.

In other words, last fall, when they made up these estimates for the deficiency requests, they though they would have about a million and a quarter veterans asking for readjustment allowances. It is running considerably less than that. General Bradley says we are now getting about $1,150,000.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. There has been a decided increase in the number of veterans requesting this allowance in the past 2 months.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This was the statement of General Bradley before the committee, and we had him before the committee two or three times. The hearings from which I quoted are dated March 17.

I do understand there has been some confusion with respect to one item in their request, but that is a matter on which we expect to take additional testimony. We expect to get some further information on that.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Who would be better informed than the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, sir, no one should be better informed than the Veterans' Administration, and General Bradley said, "Last fall, we expected $1,250,000. Now it is running $1,150,000." He agreed that the total of the figure of what had been expended during the first 7 months, plus allowing $110,000,000 for the last 5 months, made $1,505,000,000. That compares with the request in the deficiency estimates of $1,707,000,000.

You will also find in the hearings that General Bradley said that the amount required for Army and Navy pensions, on the basis of actual expenditures, would run about two hundred million below what they estimated last fall, when they prepared their deficiency estimates. I believe everyone agrees that reduction should stand.

No Member of the Congress wants to welch in any sense on any promise that has been made to the veterans. At the same time, when representatives of the Veterans' Administration come before us and tell us that things are not coming out quite the way they expected and they do not need as much money as they expected, the Congress would expect us to reduce the estimates accordingly.

There was another item for loans. I think in their estimates as they came up they indicated that a cut-back of $27,000,000 should be made. Surely we are expected to report that item in the reduced amount.

Advance estimates can be off either way, up or down, when you are setting up an activity as large as the Veterans' Administration. A year ago, when they came before the Committee on Independent Offices and asked for their money, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] knows, they estimated that 143,000 employees would do the job. But at the end of January this year they had about 220,000 employees. In other words, they just missed it by about 80,000, as to the number of employees they would have. General Bradley told us he was starting to whittle that down and he thought he could cut it down to 205,000 perhaps.

On the 1st of July 1945 the entire Veterans' Administration had eight employees assigned to public relations work. At the end of January this year they had 281 on the job of public relations. Let us not be confused between public relations and contact men. The public relations men are publicity men. You will probably hear from some of these publicity men about this cut because the Committee proposes to place a ceiling of 100 on the number of public relations or publicity people that the Veterans' Administration may have. Do not confuse those with contact representatives. The number of contact representatives the Veterans' Administration had at the end of January was approximately 6,900. So the ceiling on these publicity men will not interfere with contact representatives. There are something over 6,900 contact men still on the rolls.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Congress would pass a law to give permanent status, call it a pension, compensation, or what you please, for everyone who has been on the roll for 10 years—in other words, make his status a permanent situation, so that all they would have to do would be to issue the checks to him, in my opinion in that way they could cut down largely the employees of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is a very interesting suggestion.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I will give the gentleman my reasons for that. In 1928 and 1929 we had about as many people drawing pensions, that is, Civil War, Spanish-American War, and peacetime men, as were drawing compensation from the Veterans' Bureau, yet the expense of the Pension Bureau was only about $3,500,000 while the expense of the Veterans' Administration was about $41,000,000 or $42,000,000. It is true that a large portion of that, about $19,000,000, I believe, was due to hospitalization; but even with that eliminated the difference was about eighteen to twenty million dollars. So if instead of having a large number of people to, as the saying goes, boll weevil through the records of these boys who have been on compensation for 5 or 6, or 8 or 10 years, they be put on permanently and their cases retired to the files, in my opinion, we could cut down the number of employees in the Veterans' Administration considerably.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished gentleman who served so long as chairman of the Committee on World

War Veterans' Legislation and now is the ranking minority member, I hope will pursue that matter further in the deliberations of his committee. Certainly it is important that the country be in a position to discharge its obligations to the veterans, and nobody knows better than the gentleman who has just interrogated me that the country does not want to see the time come when somebody comes along and proposes another economy act that will strike from the pension rolls a good many men who deserve to be kept there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield to the gentleman, but I hope he will not take all my 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

I would be the last man in the House to want to balance the budget on the disabled soldiers. I fought the economy bill, because it cut a great many disabled soldiers too deeply; but I do say that there is room, if properly managed, to bring about some economy without at the same time injuring the cause of the veterans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct; but if get we economy that will help to protect our ability to pay the men who should be provided for.

Now I wish to direct your attention for just a minute to an item which appears at the bottom of page 26 following the $300,000,000 item for government and relief in occupied areas.

It is a new proviso which reads as follows:

> That it is the sense of the Congress that the governments, military and otherwise, or nations receiving aid under the provisions of this act, shall be expected to provide, in agreements to be signed by their governments when established (if not already established) for reimbursement to the United States for such aid: *Provided further*, That not exceeding $60,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for providing the necessary water transportation and transportation facilities including surplus ships which may be made available.

The first part of the proviso goes to the matter of the reimbursement of this country for the aid to be extended to occupied countries. Mr. Petersen, representing the Secretary of War, and others appearing before our committee told us it was anticipated that reimbursement would be received by crediting favorable export balances and, in addition, every effort would be made to obtain from the governments of the occupied countries such provision for future reimbursement as could be obtained. The committee thought that idea ought to have the approval of the Congress; so we provided that it is the sense of the Congress this reimbursement agreement should be sought.

The committee also felt something should be done about shipping costs. The testimony disclosed that of the money expended during the first 6 or 7 months of the year the shipping costs came to 28.6 percent of the total that was being expended for this food and relief. We thought that was just too big a proportion to go for transportation. The request for $300,000,000 contemplates $64,000,000 for that purpose. In the limitation in the second proviso we say "not to exceed $60,000,000," which will bring the cost down to not to exceed 20 percent rather than permitting it to go up to 28.6 percent.

In addition to that, we have provided that this $60,000,000 may be available for providing water transportation and transportation facilities, including surplus ships. This looks ahead to the possibility of using some of the surplus Liberty ships manned by crews of the recipient countries in line with a suggestion made by former President Hoover.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, on page 24 of this bill there is given to the Treasury Department for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation the sum of $20,000,000. This makes a total of $90,000,000 that has been given to this organization.

I have today introduced a bill providing that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall not enter into any insurance contracts to insure the protection of agricultural commodities against any loss in yield. In 1945 I fought those appropriations on the floor of the House. I had J. Carl Wright, Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, before me in my office a number of times. We discussed this. I also discussed it with Marvin Jones, and came to the conclusion that this is one of the biggest rat holes in the country for the expenditure of money and that this Corporation should be disbanded at once.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. This provision was put in the bill after considerable deliberation on the part of the committee, especially by the chairman and myself. In fact, the provision was inserted in the bill at my request. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree that while the possibilities of working out a practical insurance program for the future is a matter of debate, yet outstanding claims which have already matured should be honored?

Mr. RICH. Yes; and if the gentleman had followed me in 1945 when we tried to eliminate this, we would have saved this country from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. The country would have been better off, the farmers and everybody else would have been better off. It is a Corporation that ought to be dispensed with and the quicker that is done the better for the country.

Federal crop insurance was first authorized by Congress in 1938 and has been a losing proposition from that day to this.

The Corporation was granted an authorized capital of $100,000,000. Seventy million of this capital has been issued and all lost except about $14,000,000. More than 2 years ago I discovered this Corporation was a constant sink-hole for not only the money appropriated for running expenses by Congress, but also for the $70,000,000 capital stock issued. Having opposed the legislation on the floor of the House, I felt that no legitimate business could exist under such conditions or management, and therefore, on March 5, 1945, I sent a letter to the then manager, J. Carl Wright, in part as follows:

> MARCH 5, 1945.
>
> FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION,
> *Department of Agriculture,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
> (Attention of Mr. J. Carl Wright, Manager.)
>
> * * * * *
>
> Now in order that I, as a Member of Congress, can expect—and I shall expect—a good business administration, not only of your Corporation but all Government corporations, I am asking for a report on the qualifications of yourself as well as the other members of your board of directors to handle insurance, and what experience you have had to qualify you for appointment to the position you occupy. Have you carried out the intent and purpose of the Congress in trying to conduct this Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on a basis that would be commensurate with sound business principles? Are your rates such for the year 1945 that, from your past experience, the insurance you put in force will pay the expenses of the operation of the Corporation; and if in normal years, would you break even, or have a balanced budget, or would you have losses? If so, how much would your losses be; or would there be a likelihood of a gain, and why?
>
> You were given $40,000,000 for this Corporation; and you lost, according to your reports, $37,500,000 plus the seven million that you made on the increased price of grains. Today you only have left $2,500,000, of the forty million that was given you to start operation. What recommendations have you made for changes in law, if any are necessary, to make your organization a successful insurance corporation?
>
> Now I am not personally acquainted with you, or any of the other managers, and I do not wish to offend you. I am merely asking for a report that I can follow up to determine whether this Corporation is even trying to be successful, or whether there is a motive behind this to give hand-outs to the farmers in the guise of insurance. I believe it would be very wise for you to be absolutely frank and open and aboveboard in your reply, giving me all the facts. I am not inquiring of you anything that I would not inquire of any other corporation which I knew to be as unsuccessful as your Corporation has been since 1939.

For 19 days I waited for an answer to this letter, and on March 24, 1945, received a four-page letter, dated March 23, 1945.

In reference to my inquiry requesting a report on the qualifications and experience of the Manager and the Board of Directors who handle this insurance, I received the following quotation from said letter:

> You have asked also for a report on the qualifications of myself and members of the Board of Directors. With regard to my own qualifications, I have been Manager only since September 1943. I would be pleased to come to your office at your convenience to answer this question in person.
>
> The Board of Directors are men each of whom has been successful in his own field of work, and are as follows:

Mr. E. R. Duke, Chairman, Director of War Boards.

Mr. W. A. Jump, Director of Finance of the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration.

Mr. W. B. Boyd, Director of Price, War Food Administration.

The Board of Directors are appointed by the War Food Administrator. The Board appoints the Manager of the Corporation.

If there is other information you would desire as to myself or the operation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, I would be pleased to furnish it or come to your office at your convenience and discuss the same with you.

Sincerely yours,

J. CARL WRIGHT,
Manager.

From the foregoing it was readily seen neither the manager nor any member of the Board knew anything about insurance. Two of the directors were appointed from the War Food Administration and the Chairman from a directorship of the war boards.

Their only qualifications from this letter showed that they had no experience in insurance and thus no qualifications whatsoever to manage this Corporation. They were simply transferred or appointed from one political agency of the Government to another, regardless of their competency to handle or even to understand either crop or any other kind of insurance business.

No corporation on earth engaged in private business would even consider men to run or manage its affairs without more experience and competency than these men had, according to this letter. They appear to be totally unfitted for the top positions they have occupied. It would be just as reasonable to have a blacksmith perform an appendicitis operation as to have such men run a crop-insurance corporation.

Because this letter was so unsatisfactory and lacking in information, I sent another letter to the Honorable Marvin Jones, then War Food Administrator, on the 24th day of March 1945, which, in part, read as follows:

MARCH 24, 1945.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Agriculture Administration Building,
Washington, D. C.:

* * * * *

I am much concerned in some of the objectives of government. When the first deficiency appropriation bill, asking for an appropriation of $30,000,000 additional for the Federal crop-insurance program came before the House, March 2, I opposed the item mainly on the point that the crop-insurance program had been in effect 5 years, and during that time the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation lost $37,500,000 of the original $40,000,000 appropriated and had invested $7,000,000 in wheat and made a profit, which they lost also. I came to the conclusion that this was a mighty poorly organized and managed business under the law to lose such a great amount of their capital in such a short time.

Now, I understand that the War Food Administrator appoints the Board of Directors of this Corporation and they are composed of the following: Mr. E. R. Duke, Mr. W. A. Jump, and Mr. W. B. Boyd.

The Board in turn appoint the Manager. I would like to know from you, Marvin, what experience these men have had in insurance; what experience have they had in making rates; why is it that this Corporation has been so very, very unsuccessful? Since it is your responsibility to appoint the Board of Directors, certainly you should look into the operation of this Corporation. I would like to know what are the qualifications of these Directors and the Manager, Mr. J. Carl Wright, that you entrust them with such a sum of money and it is dissipated in such a short time.

This just does not make sense to me as a businessman, Marvin. I am writing you this letter not with the idea of interfering with any successful organization, but of trying to help one that is not successful, and if the right men are not at the head, then it is up to you to change them. I know none of these men personally, but am going to keep my eye on this Corporation in the future for successful operation. If I can be of any assistance, you know you may command me.

This letter to the War Food Administrator was answered on the 7th day of April 1945, and is as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 7, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RICH: I have your letter of March 24, which is in connection with the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and can well understand your concern regarding the financial position of the Corporation after 5 years' operations in insuring wheat and 2 years' in insuring cotton. The results have been disappointing to us, and we recognize that mistakes were made in the development and administration of the program. However, when the program was initiated there was no experience in this field upon which we could draw. Experience has now been acquired which should prove invaluable in future operations, and we hope to profit by this experience even though much of it is not on the credit side of the ledger.

Although indemnities exceeded premium collections by approximately $37,500,000 during this period and the desirable objective of providing insurance without impairment of the capital stock of the Corporation was not realized, this amount as well as the premiums collected was paid to farmers who suffered crop losses from adverse weather and other hazards over which they had no control. Without this protection many of these farmers would have been forced into liquidation. From the standpoint of national welfare, it could, therefore, hardly be said that these funds represent a total loss.

When the amendment to the Crop Insurance Act became effective December 23, 1944, I immediately appointed a new board of directors of the Corporation. One of these men worked in the crop-insurance program for a number of years and was selected because of the constructive suggestions which he made for improvement in the program during that time and because I considered that his experience would be useful in avoiding errors in the future. The other two were selected because of their long experience in the administration of agricultural programs and because of their reputations for dependability and sound judgment. I am sure you will agree that the administration of an all-risk insurance program on crops involves thorough knowledge of farming methods, the nature of the crops insured, and the hazards which are encountered in producing various crops as well as certain insurance principles. It is an agricultural program which requires the application of sound insurance principles in its operations.

At the time the program was reinstated after the passage of the act of December 23, 1944, it was extremely difficult to obtain the services of able insurance executives although we recognized that it was necessary for the corporation to have available the best possible insurance counsel and advice. Accordingly, the board of directors, with my concurrence, has entered into a contract with Ekern & Meyers, a Chicago firm which has an outstanding reputation in this field, to assist the management in developing the program along sound insurance lines. The senior member of this firm served as chairman of a consulting committee which in 1941 and 1942 made an analysis of the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The committee published a report containing a number of specific recommendations for changes and most of the recommended changes have been incorporated in the present program. Mr. Ekern has been in Washington almost continuously during the past 2 months for the purpose of assisting the management in developing an insurance program on cotton, wheat, and flax on a Nationwide basis, and for cotton and tobacco on an experimental basis.

In view of the late date on which the legislation was enacted, these programs had to be developed hurriedly in order to make them applicable to crops planted in 1945. We are endeavoring to do the very best job we can in the limited time available.

I have been most interested in having the crop-insurance program succeed and have personally met with the agricultural committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate and sought their counsel and advice. I feel that the objectives of the program are so desirable that no work should be spared, and every possible avenue which might offer a sound approach should be explored in an effort directed toward successful operation.

I shall maintain an active interest in the program; and if changes appear to be necessary either in the personnel of the Corporation or in program provisions within the framework set up by the law, you may be assured that such changes will be made.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

This letter admits that premiums were exceeded by losses or indemnities by approximately $37,500,000, and the 1945 crop was not included because it was not yet harvest time and losses could then neither be ascertained nor determined.

Furthermore, it was therein asserted that the Board of Directors, with the consent of the War Food Administrator, had entered into a contract with the firm of Ekern and Meyers, a Chicago concern, to assist the management in developing the program along sound insurance lines. What was paid this firm is not reported. But their employment seems to have ended. Why was it necessary to employ this firm at all? Why not appoint men skilled in insurance, instead of men who know nothing about the business? And above all, what good did these men do in furtherance of making crop insurance self-supporting? The record seems to disclose that the results brought about by these men to crop insurance amounted to very little, judging from results, and the Crop Insurance Corporation still continues to run at a loss.

In addition to the letters sent the departments, numerous interviews were had with those in authority but all ended in either an acknowledgment of failure in the past or a promise to make a better showing in the future.

Long and involved statements and reports were issued from time to time by the Department of Agriculture purporting to show some reason for the continuance of crop insurance by the Govern-

ment. However, a thorough examination of these reports invariably discloses that in the end the result was not only always disappointing but frequently unwarranted and indefensible, and a continuance of the project pointed to such loss to the Government which in a private corporation could only end in certain bankruptcy. But these losses that no private corporation can endure without disaster to both its usefulness and its stockholders, surely no Government can stand indefinitely. Sooner or later there must be an accounting and the longer such accounting is delayed the more serious it becomes and the more damage it does to the Government and the taxpayers who must support it.

Nevertheless, this letter of the War Food Administrator made promises and furnished a ray of hope to those of us who had seen the constant loss of the Crop Insurance Corporation. The Administrator's letter contained the following:

Experience has now been acquired which should prove invaluable in future operations, and we hope to profit by this experience even though much of it is not on the credit side of the ledger.

Again, we wanted to see what the "acquired experience" would bring about. One of the things brought about during that same year of 1945 was a worse deficit than had been suffered at any time before in the entire history of crop insurance. Another significant thing likewise brought about was the resignation of the War Food Administrator from his position as head of the agency or corporation for crop insurance and his appointment to another Government office or position.

Perhaps he saw the error in his prediction that "acquired experience" should prove invaluable in future operations, and abandoned crop insurance for a more congenial field of endeavor. In the meantime the American people, hoping for a balanced crop-insurance budget, must have felt the truth of the old proverb, "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick," as they saw the perpetually rising deficit.

The true financial condition of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has been not only difficult but impossible to obtain. However at long last, on March 25, 1947, a belated audit report to Congress on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was placed on my desk for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, by the Comptroller General of the United States. Why was this report delayed by 1 year and approximately 9 months after June 30, 1945? Where is the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946? What is actually the condition of this Corporation at present? These are pertinent questions and should be answered.

The confusion shown in this report is plainly evident. Beginning on page 4, I quote the following:

9. We are unable to give an opinion that the financial statements of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fairly present its financial position at June 30, 1945, and its results of operations for the year ended that date for the following reasons:

(a) The financial statements do not include the results of operations for the 1945 crop year.

(b) The reserve for losses on collections for premiums for the 1943 and prior crop years may be inadequate.

However, the financial statements and comments in the report set forth these matters as completely as possible.

10. It is suggested that the Congress give consideration to the feasibility of continuance of the crop insurance program, and if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended that every possible step be taken to make the program financially successful. In this connection the following recommendations are submitted:

(a) The Corporation's management should be set up under a larger Board of Directors, serving on a part-time basis and including men of experience in insurance matters as well as the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of agriculture and the general public. It should not be dominated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The active management of the Corporation's affairs should be in executive officers selected by the Board. In addition to a man versed in farming, the top officers should include an individual with a broad insurance background, another who is an expert in insurance-sales promotion, and a controller serving as chief accounting officer. (See p. 7.)

(c) Every effort should be devoted toward development of sound underwriting policies and practices, insurance-sales promotion, and improved financial and accounting practices.

(d) Insurance contracts should be written in monetary terms rather than in commodity terms; this involves certain difficulties. (See p. 16.)

(e) The Corporation should have a fiscal year ending December 31, after the close of the crop season. (See p. 39.)

(f) Accounting for operating expenses should be simplified. (See p. 25.)

(g) The cotton plan should be reduced to a trial basis until sufficient reliable information has been gained to warrant the resumption of Nation-wide participation. (See p. 20.)

(h) We believe consideration should be given to allowing the management freedom by law to exclude areas from insurance on individual crops, when it finds there is little demand or economic need for such insurance in those areas. This would permit a substantial savings in operating expenses.

Subsequent to completion of this audit, but prior to release of this report, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson made public a letter to the chairman of the Agriculture Committees of both Houses of Congress in which he enclosed a letter directed to the Manager of the Corporation. The letter voiced views and criticisms of and suggestions by the Secretary, based on two studies which had been made for him by representatives of the National Association of Insurance Agents and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co. A subsequent press release pointed out the action already taken by the management to remedy some of the conditions to which attention was called and to withdraw certain of the criticisms. Many of our comments coincide with those contained in these reports which indicate a feeling within the Department of Agriculture of need for broad changes in the program.

From the foregoing it is seen that officers themselves do not know where they are going when they say "we are unable to give an opinion that the financial statements of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fairly present its financial position." This is certainly a remarkable statement from a Corporation report. It reminds one of Dooly's grasshopper "that had a hell of a lot of action, but damn little direction."

In paragraph 10 we also find the following:

10. It is suggested that the Congress give consideration to the feasibility of continuance of the crop-insurance program, and if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended that every possible step be taken to make the program financially successful.

Of course it would take real courage to come out into the open and admit failure, but this statement comes as near to it as possible when it is acknowledged that if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended, and so forth. We suggest a reading of this recommendation.

The following quotation from page 7 of the report also shows that possibly my letters hereinbefore mentioned to this Corporation management, suggesting men of insurance experience to run it, may have been of some effect, for on page 7 of the report:

It is suggested that the importance of the crop-insurance program and the difficulties of establishing a sound program, if it be continued, require the policy-making direction of a Board of Directors composed of men experienced in insurance matters as well as representatives of agriculture and the general public. We recommend that, if the program is to be continued, the law should be amended to provide for a larger Board of Directors, serving on a part-time basis and including men of experience in insurance matters as well as the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of agriculture and the general public; it should not be dominated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Active management of the Corporation's affairs should be in executive officers elected by the Board, including a president, one or more vice presidents, and a controller. One of the top officers should be a man with a broad insurance background, especially from an actuarial standpoint, because of the necessity of establishing sound underwriting policies and practices. Another, well versed in sales promotion, should be charged with improving sales technique and actively directing the sales organization. The controller, as the chief accounting officer, should have full responsibility and authority in directing all accounting activities in order to obtain better accounting and financial policies than now prevail.

However, it is to be noted that this report contains many remarkable statements suggestive of a desire to continue the Corporation even with its unsavory financial record, but at the same time admitting the probability of its discontinuance by Congress, such statements being: "If the program be continued we recommend," or "suggest," and so forth.

Page 17 of this report shows the costs of the program to 1945 to be as follows:

Insurance losses	$38,126,200
Operating expenses	32,742,082
Total loss	70,868,282

Table does not include losses on 1945 crop program estimated to be $13,641,550 but not recorded in accounts at June 30, 1945.

In addition to losses resulting from the excess of indemnities over premiums, the insurance loss figure reflects $382,669 of unallocated costs, the largest portion of which was a provision of $375,000 for losses on uncollectible premiums at June 30, 1945.

The act charges the Board of Directors with fixing premiums at rates sufficient to cover claims for indemnities and to establish a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses. Premiums are not required to be sufficient

to cover any portion of the operating expenses (see p. 24). To date, not only has no reserve been accumulated, but capital has been consumed to the extent of $38,126,200, exclusive of losses estimated for the 1945 fiscal year. Without exception, premiums failed to meet indemnities on all crops in each of the first 5 years as shown in terms of quantities in table IV.

The loss for 1945, which is above estimated to be $13,641,550, but is not included in the above calculation, amounts really, according to letter of Secretary Anderson released February 26, 1947, to the astounding sum of $17,536,218.74. And the end is not yet. If 1945 losses amount to $17,536,218.74 this sum added to the losses before 1945 which are admitted to be $70,868,282, the total through 1945 equals $88,404,500.74. And what about losses of the year 1946, which are admittted to be very high?

When all the reports come in, may we not expect to find that even the entire sum of the capital stock of this corporation, that has already been issued amounting to $70,000,000 and poured by the United States Government into this sinkhole, is entirely exhausted? We are surely warranted in assuming it to be gone in the light of the action of the Secretary of Agriculture who has held up all payments on cotton indemnities until Congress makes further appropriations.

This Corporation has, on its record, been "weighed and found wanting" and is still wanting, wanting, wanting—more money to keep its total of 945 employees on the public pay roll, notwithstanding its constant failures and losses in operation.

It has been reported, and I believe reliably so, that in many instances policies were taken by this Corporation on crops that were only planted and then abandoned by the farmer because it would pay him better to realize on his insurance than to cultivate and take care of his crops. Thus the chinch bug, the potato bug, the grasshopper, and the boll weevil had not only field days, but whole field seasons, under this crop-insurance plan, and increased, multiplied, and replenished their kind so tremendously until in some sections of the country they are destined to be difficult if not impossible to destroy.

In truth, crop insurance is tending to injure the farmer instead of benefiting him. Personally I have seen some fields of uncut grain long after the harvest season was past—fields that would yield, in my opinion, an average crop. Upon inquiry I learned that the grain was left standing in the field for the crows and other birds because it would cost considerable to harvest it and the farmer believed he could realize more from his crop insurance than would be possible if he harvested it. I am informed that this is a rather frequent occurrence in the cotton fields, and a potent factor in the great losses suffered there.

Since the losses in crop insurance have invariably been so heavy since its beginning, the time is at hand when it should be discontinued without delay. I hope this Congress that should be—and I believe it is—desiring to take this country out of the red, will no longer appropriate any money for the continuance of crop insurance but repeal the act in its entirety. Let the insurance people who are qualified in business assume crop insurance, if it is to exist at all. Let us kill the bill. Let us help save America from bankruptcy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to the matter of crop insurance, I would like to say for the RECORD, in view of my conversation on the floor with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that I approve the theory of crop insurance. I only regret that up to now it has not been possible for Congress and for the Corporation to devise a program that is workable from the standpoint of the country and from the standpoint of the producer, and I feel that the matter should be given further study by the Congress in the light of the experience which we have had.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 6.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, 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. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Committee on Un-American Activities by Mrs. Julia W. Talmadge, president-general of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript. He has been informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but he asks that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SLOVAKIA

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, America and all liberty-loving nations should at this time concentrate against international situations which might bring about war in the future. I have, on several occasions, stated on the floor of Congress that the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter is our greatest antidote for future peace. Self-government, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion is as essential for smaller countries as it is for the large nations. Our Nation, during World War II, spent billions of dollars and sacrificed in lives and casualties to preserve the above principles in order to insure liberty and future peace.

Since VJ-day, aggression and tyranny has again been launched in certain areas of Europe. The latest example of persecution, unfair trial, and threatened execution for political belief is that of Dr. Joseph Tiso, former President of the Interim Republic of Slovakia. Dr. Tiso has been acclaimed a hero in the eyes of nearly all the people of Slovakia and the prevailing majority of Americans of Slovak ancestry. My attention has been called to the fact that over 80 percent of the Slovak American fraternal organizations have forthrightly declared themselves to be of the opinion that Tiso was a hero in the defense of the best interests of the Slovak people. During his presidency, Slovakia thrived, progressed, and developed internally more than it had during any 5 years of the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic. The communistic control now over the country of Slovakia will execute Dr. Tiso, a political prisoner, unless our Government intervenes. This communistic control is inflicted upon the people of Slovakia in spite of the fact that the election of May 26, 1946, gave over 64 percent of the total vote cast against the present government. The press is likewise controlled, at least to the extent that the newspapers cannot publish what they think. This is evidenced in the fact that four American newspapers have been barred in Slovakia. The present communistic government will brook no freedom of political thought; though the people voted for Christian democracy, they received totalitarian communism.

The archbishop of Slovakia testified at the trial of Dr. Tiso. He is and has been a respected member not only of the hierarchy of Czechoslovakia, but of the official family of Czechoslovakia, including its President, Edward Benes. Appearing as a witness for Dr. Tiso, the archbishop testified that—

> Tiso acted and worked in the interest of Slovakia and was never a traitor, and that his election as President of Slovakia was the will of 90 percent of the Slovaks at that time and was acclaimed by the bishops, priests, and ministers of both the Catholic and Protestant churches.

It is apparent that Czechoslovakia has been re-created with the aid of Moscow and that Moscow will undoubtedly demand the extinction of Slovak national leaders of ability and high intellect. The ways of the Communists are devious and it behooves us to understand more of the Slovakia situation. In the meantime, the least that freedom loving nations can ask is that the so-called peoples courts in the Communist-dominated countries in eastern Europe, refrain from

any further political executions or from liquidating political opposition by long-term imprisonment as in the case of Archbishop Stepanic. All of this adds up to the price we will have to pay to aid in the establishing of true democracy in the countries of eastern Europe to insure world peace.

In supporting President Truman's international program, we cannot be unmindful of what is happening throughout this region in Europe, comprising over 100,000,000 Christians who have nothing in common with communism. We have heard of political executions, imprisonment, and banishment of outstanding citizens in Poland, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other small countries. Thousands of brave Polish soldiers who fought to stamp out fascism are now prohibited from returning to their native Poland by a communistic controlled government. Americans are asking the question "do we not have at least a moral obligation to voice our protest against such trials and executions?"

The judge who presided at the trial of Dr. Tiso, previous to the trial, vowed personal vengeance on Tiso and was provided this opportunity by being placed in charge of the case.

These facts, though not appearing in the American press releases, are not disputed. Almost unanimously, the people of Slovak descent in America, are rising in protest to the impending execution of Dr. Tiso. I ask the Members of Congress to join with me in protesting this unjust conviction by interceding with President Truman and Secretary Marshall to use their good offices to prevent this injustice.

We might well apply the words of the Honorable Judge Robert H. Jackson:

> All experience teaches that there are certain things you cannot do under the guise of judicial trial. * * * You must put no man on trial before anything that is called a court, if you are not prepared to establish his personal guilt. * * * If you are determined to execute a man in any case, there is no occasion for trial. The world yields no respect to courts that are merely organized to convict.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. GAMBLE), for an indefinite time, on account of illness.

To Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. O'TOOLE), for the week of March 31, 1947, on account of death in family.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 2 days, March 31 and April 1, on account of illness.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL-GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 26, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Because of my other duties and committee assignments, I am forced to resign as a member of the Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard Commission. Please consider my resignation effective as of this date.

I do want to thank you for paying me the honor of having me appointed a member of the Commission and I regret that I am unable to serve.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 19, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LOANS TO GREECE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, since 1824 when the new Greek Government, having fought a war of independence, obtained its first foreign loan from the London banks, that nation has been in financial bondage. The bankers of England and Europe discovered long ago that they had easy pickings in Greece. Year after year, they would extend large loans at top interest rates, and would take first mortgages on the revenue of the Greek Government. By 1843, the accumulated debts amounted to 66,000,000 drachmas. But that was just a beginning. There were the loans of 1879, for example, of 60,000,000 francs at 6 percent interest; there was the loan of 1881 of 120,000,000 francs at 5 percent interest; there was the loan of 1884 of 170,000,000 francs at 5 percent interest; there was the loan of 1887 of 135,000,000 francs at 4 percent interest.

It was natural that the London bankers should exact heavy service charges. Each new loan generally would provide for a certain amount of repayment on the old debt. Various requirements would be made for purchases abroad. All kinds of curious and interesting deductions were levied which made the net proceeds of these loans to the Greek Government comparatively small. The international London bankers did not let the Greek Government pay back the principal. They pushed the Greek Government further and further into debt, and constantly increased the service charges.

Indeed between 1879 and 1897, the Greeks paid a total of 470,000,000 francs for service and interest on their national debt, an amount corresponding roughly to the total amount borrowed, yet were unable to reduce the size of the total debt. On the contrary, their public debt rose from 1869 to 1893 from 137,000,000 to 823,000,000 drachmas.

But in 1897, Mr. Speaker, the bankers of London were just getting under way on bleeding Greece. There were two or three wars between 1890 and 1912 in the Balkans and the Near East in which Greece became involved. I would not suggest, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the bankers had anything to do with it. Subsequently, between 1912 and 1933, the foreign indebtedness of Greece rose from 840,000,000 gold francs to 1,650,000,000 gold francs in 1933. Somebody, Mr. Speaker, was making money, but it was not the Greek people.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1897 the London bankers apparently wanted to make sure that they would get their interest, so they arranged an International Finance Commission to control Greek Government finances in order to safeguard the interest payments on the foreign indebtedness of the Greek Government. This commission, by agreement with the Greek Government, received the income from government monopolies in salt, kerosene, matches, cigarette paper, stamp taxes, and the custom duties of the Port of Pireaus. At various times in 1926, and again in 1929, and again in 1933, new revenues were pledged in order to be sure that the interest on the foreign indebtedness was paid. The Treaty of Geneva, for example, established in 1927, added new revenues in order to take care of new loans. The International Finance Commission obtained the revenue from the alcohol tax throughout Greece. The custom duties of six new cities were added to the revenue. In fact, Mr. Speaker, after 1927, the only unpledged public revenue left to the Greek Government were direct taxes, miscellaneous excise taxes, and export duties. Believe it or not, this commission still today continues to exist.

Mr. Speaker, does the International Finance Commission still have legal status? Is the greater portion of all revenue of the Greek Government still pledged for the payment of taxes on the Greek foreign indebtedness?

In round American dollars, the Greek Government owes apparently over five hundred million to the international bankers. The interest and principal of 90 percent of all of these loans are payable at the Hambro International Bank of London.

Mr. Speaker, the American people would like to know whether the loan proposed under the Truman Greek deal will go to pay off the bankers of London or whether it will go to assist the Greek people. Mr. Speaker, we should like to know whether or not the proposed loans to be made by us to the Greek Government will become a first mortgage on the revenue of the Creek Government or whether the international bank of London gets theirs first.

Mr. Speaker, from 1821 until today the international banks of London have received anywhere from four to five times the amount in interest, service charges, and other deductions—five times the amount they have actually lent the Greek Government during that period.

With the help of a corrupt monarchy, the international bankers have bled the Greek people and the Greek nation for five times what they have lent that country, and still today have by legal right the first lien, the first mortgage, on more than one-half of all the income of the Greek Government.

Mr. Speaker, the American people refuse to be suckers for a hundred-year-old scandal of international financial intrigue and blood-sucking.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of March 30, 1947]

TRUMAN'S "LOAN" PLAN GIVEN COLD APPRAISAL

For the benefit of those readers who came in late on our discussions of the $400,000,000 Greco-Turkish loan, we submit the following dialog in which the editor is being questioned by a young man who has been reading the newspapers and finds himself, as nearly everyone else, slightly confused on the subject.

Question. What is the real purpose behind President Truman's proposal to lend Greece and Turkey $400,000,000?

Answer. To stop the Russians.

Question. What are the Russians doing in Greece and Turkey?

Answer. Helping Greek and Turkish Communists to spread communistic propaganda and undermine the Governments.

Question. Are there any Russians in Greece and Turkey?

Answer. No.

Question. Then what are we worried about?

Answer. England has decided that she can no longer afford to finance King George's regime and has turned the job over to us.

Question. President Truman stated that 85 percent of the Greeks favor the present Government. If that is true, how can the other 15 percent overthrow the 85 percent who are supporting the King?

Answer. That's what we would like to know.

Question. When did England make this decision?

Answer. Secretary of State Byrnes was warned of the possibility last October but the British acted only 3 weeks ago.

Question. Why does Russia want to gobble up Greece and Turkey?

Answer. For centuries, the Russians have tried to get control of the Dardanelles. They were stopped by Britain and France in the Crimean War. After Russia whipped Turkey in 1877, Britain and other great powers deprived Russia of most of the fruits of victory in the treaty making.

Question. Why are Greece and Turkey so important to the British?

Answer. To protect British oil interests and the life-line through the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal and the road to India and other British Far East possessions.

Question. Will the proposed $400,000,000 loan keep the Russians out of Greece?

Answer. Not if they use force.

Question. Have there been any indications that Russia intends to invade Greece and Turkey?

Answer. No. So far, the Russians have been content to wage a propaganda war of nerves.

Question. Why can't the United Nations handle a situation of this sort?

Answer. The UN conceivably could succeed as it did in Iran where the Russians gave up their attempts to establish a government friendly to the USSR when the force of public opinion became too strong.

Question. Why didn't we try to solve this situation through the United Nations?

Answer. You will have to get the answer to that one from President Truman.

Question. Wasn't the UN established to stop potential aggressors?

Answer. Yes, but Representative GEORGE SMATHERS of Florida says it hasn't had time to catch up with world problems.

Question. Is this a good argument?

Answer. Not in my opinion.

Question. What about Turkey?

Answer. Turkey was Germany's ally in World War I and aided the Axis powers in World War II while posing as a neutral.

Question. Do you personally know this to be true?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If we are trying to stop the spread of communism in Greece with dollars, what about other nations facing similar situations?

Answer. They will all have communism for sale at a price.

Question. Will we loan them money, too?

Answer. Yes, if the President and his advisers are sincere in their crusade against communism.

Question. Do you have any doubts about that?

A. I don't like to question men's motives but there are certain political advantages these days in fighting communism. You may have noticed that the President is now determined to purge his administration of known communists. Some of us urged the same course of action years ago when Communists within the Government were being accepted in the best Washington circles as liberals.

Question. Is the Russian threat similar to Hitler's march in the Rhineland?

Answer. No. In Hitler's case, England and France winked cynically at the violation of the Versailles treaty because Great Britain's traditional policy of power politics always made her cuddle up to the second strongest power in Europe.

Question. What do you think of William Bullitt's recommendation that the United States should not "hesitate to use the atomic bomb to stop new crimes of Soviet imperialism"?

Answer. Bullitt is a volatile, unstable ass who failed in every ambassadorial post and thought he could persuade the Russians to like us by teaching them to play polo.

Question. Did Franklin D. Roosevelt get along with the Russians?

Answer. Very well indeed, by giving them nine-tenths of the Balkans, the Kuriles, Dairen, Port Arthur and half of the 20 billions in reparations from Germany and everything else that wasn't nailed down.

Question. I see the Turks don't want any strings attached to the United States loan.

Answer. That's right. When you offer to lend a fellow money, he sometimes gets arrogant about it.

Question. Why did Governor Dewey give the Greco-Turkish loan his support?

Answer. Hadn't you noticed? Mr. Dewey is running for president. His statement fitted in nicely with designation of March 25 as "Greek War Relief day."

Question. Aren't you in favor of helping the Greeks?

Answer. Absolutely. The resources of the International bank (formed for that purpose) could help stabilize the Greek economy. Greek credits frozen in London should also be used. A private charity drive for Greek relief would be enthusiastically supported in the United States. Actually, we have already given the Greeks $358,000,000 in food, clothing, medical and other supplies.

Question. Why then, don't you favor a Government loan and so forth as it has been called?

Answer. Because it is an open invitation to war.

Question. What do you mean by that?

Answer. Approval of the loan by Congress will mean that we have sidetracked the United Nations to take over Great Britain's traditional role as world policeman. It will mean that we are shaking our fist in Russia's face and warning her not to try any more of "that funny stuff."

It will mean that we are pledged to fight communism wherever it may exist and at whatever cost. It will mean that we are discarding world democracy for visions of empire.

It will mean that all of the high and lofty principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations have been scrapped.

It is a road that can lead only to war.

Question. But Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Secretary of War Patterson say they see slight possibility of war, and that "the sending of combat troops is not contemplated."

Answer. That "not contemplated" phrase, my boy, is better known as diplomatic double talk.

Question. What would you do about the spread of communism?

Answer. Communism is an ideology that cannot be stopped by sticking a $400,000,000 thorn into Russia's side. To quote an unknown author, "Communism will be stopped by something that works better."

No lasting support will accrue to communism unless it is believed to yield benefits which the capitalistic system cannot provide.

Let us demonstrate, as expressed by Allen Haden, formerly of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, "that our system is a living, breathing, satisfying system within which men and women live better and more freely than in any other."

Question. What did you think of Fiorello LaGuardia's remark that "conditions in the Balkans can't be corrected overnight or in 10 years—it will take a generation"? Also, his statement that we will rue the day we ever entered the Balkans alone?

Answer. I agree. But the military is already girding its loins for war.

The pronouncement by Admiral Chester Nimitz that "the Army and Navy are prepared for operations that might have to be carried on in the event of another national emergency" is ominously prophetic.

When top-drawer admirals of Nimitz's caliber start talking about "operations," they don't mean target practice.

Question. You sound mighty pessimistic, Mr. Editor.

Maybe I'd better start thinking about what branch of service I'd like.

Answer. That's no joke, son.

How about a nice, safe job in the State Department?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to provide for the printing and distribution of certain matter relating to congressional activities, authorized by section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 931. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title 111 of the Second War Powers Act.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on March 28, 1947, present to the President, for his approval,

a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. A joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard; and

H. J. Res. 159. A joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

504. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

505. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report sh wing credit operations through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

506. A letter from the Associate Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Cecil T. May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

507. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

508. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to the organic act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the authorities of the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, as well as the several States, in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

509. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of November 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

510. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the United States Government to grant employees leaves of absence for research and study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

511. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

512. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services, H. R. 1375. A bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2331. A bill to amend section 20A of the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLSWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2336. A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2758. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2568. A bill authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2759. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; with amendments (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2856. A bill to provide transportation of passengers on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2857. A bill to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 2858. A bill to provide a permanent civil-service status to certain Federal employees and reinstatement rights to former employees who have been discharged from the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 2859. A bill to regulate the sale of essays or proofs of postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2860. A bill to provide protection for designs for textile fabrics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2861. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2862. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services injuriously affecting the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2863. A bill to provide for the protection of the Dall sheep, caribou, and other wildlife native to the Mount McKinley National Park area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 2864. A bill to provide that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall not enter into insurance contracts to insure producers of agricultural commodities against any loss in yields; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2865. A bill to provide a sea wall or other form of shore protection at the town of Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2866. A bill to extend percentage depletion at the 15-percent rate to bentonite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2867. A bill to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2868. A bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide that the beneficiaries of certain Government employees who died between December 6, 1941, and December 21, 1944, shall be compensated for leave accumulated and accrued by such employees but not taken; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2870. A bill to amend the act approved February 25, 1946, permitting the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2871. A bill to amend section 302 (a) of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2872. A bill to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROCKWELL:

H. R. 2873. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2874. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 2875. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator through the Commissioner of Public Buildings to operate the building known as the Capitol Park Hotel as a dwelling for Members of Congress and their employees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2876. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2877. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2878. A bill to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2879. A bill to authorize the unconditional grant of all interest of the United States in certain school buildings and temporary housing to educational institutions without consideration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the St. Louis World's Fair 1953, Inc., in the city of St. Louis, during the year 1953; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 165. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the administration of the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Res. 166. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Agriculture to undertake an investigation with respect to the potato surplus; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with the view to returning to the Territorial government all public lands, especially park and beach areas, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging and recommending that legislation be enacted to provide for two United States district judges, instead of only one, for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska, and that said additional district judge be located at Valdez, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that road funds allotted the Public Roads Administration for new construction in Alaska be materially increased; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsement of H. R. 1770; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that an extension of the road in Chugach National Forest for a distance of approximately 9.6 miles to Point Whitehed be authorized and that funds therefor be specifically allocated from public roads and National Forest Service funds for such work in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish regulation W; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the completion of the San Diego aqueduct with Government funds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of Miklos Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2881. A bill for the relief of Henry Atmik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 2882. A bill for the relief of Alexander George Kalesky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2883. A bill for the relief of Louis Angelefsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 2884. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2885. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2886. A bill authorizing the sale under supervision of land of Richard Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2887. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Bernard Old Coyote, Sr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Sternshein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2889. A bill for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 2890. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Gaspare Vassura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 2891. A bill for the relief of Mattie A. Horner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2892. A bill for the relief of Henrique David Fernandes Garim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2893. A bill for the relief of Chester Chuji Fujino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2894. A bill for the relief of Domenico Salvi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2895. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Terwilliger and Alberta M. Terwilliger Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2897. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2899. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of John Tomlingson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

286. By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Petition to the Congress from the distributors of TVA power; to the Committee on Public Works.

287. By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 15 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

288. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition transmitted by Mr. R. C. Carpenter in behalf of Local Union No. 129, Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Frankfort Heights, Ill., petitioning Congress to make revision upward in the benefits of social-security annuitants and for the reduction in the age requirement from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. Also, petition transmitted by Mr. Robert Harriman in behalf of Local Union No. 73; Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Marissa, Ill., petitioning Congress to make revision upward in the benefits of social-security annuitants and for the reduction in the age requirement from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

290. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of the officers and executive committee of the Maine State Bar Association, by Herbert E. Locke, secretary and treasurer, Augusta, Maine, expressing their approval and endorsement of the bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act, H. R. 1639; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. Also, resolution of Assembly No. 3, Slovak Catholic Sokol, Lisbon Falls, Maine, Helen Tenco, president, and Mary Adams, secretary, urging congressional investigation of the Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

292. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 6355, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge that the full amount necessary to the usual efficient conduct of the Customs Bureau be provided in the Federal budget to insure that the operations of that important agency of government shall not be curtailed or rendered ineffective; to the Committee on Appropriations.

293. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. Treciokas and other Lithuanian displaced persons, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to making efforts to change immigration laws, permitting all Lithuanian refugees in western Europe to enter the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. Also, petition of Robert L. Reynolds, Madison, Wis., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a proposal to

deal with strike situations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

295. Also, petition of the Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

296. Also, petition of John Riner, president, group 9, SS. Cyril and Methodius of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, Johnstown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

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

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

When we are honestly perplexed and have to do something, and are not sure what to do, we need Thy help, O God. In our choices let us not ask, "Will it work?" but, rather, "Is it right?" In this prayer we reach up to Thee. May we find that Thou art reaching down to us, and may we believe that when we are willing to listen Thou wilt speak. We wait upon Thee, O God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, March 31, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 1, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1621) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the world jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947, and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Prior to the call of the roll, may the Chair say that the Foreign Relations Committee presents the request that it be permitted to sit the remainder of the day. Without objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears no objection.

(At this point Mr. BARKLEY yielded to Mr. WILEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MYERS, respectively, each of whom, as in legislative session, presented matters of routine business, which appear elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I renew my point of order that there is not a quorum present.

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	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records. It is a unanimous report of that committee. It may be necessary later in the day to ask unanimous consent that the nomination be taken up for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 27)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency amounting to $20,000, fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment as contained in House Document No. 101, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with the view to returning to the Territorial government all public lands, especially park and beach areas, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby, requested to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with a view to returning to the territorial government all public lands, particularly beach areas and areas suitable for public parks, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."